

---

---

## VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

---

---

The CEQA Guidelines require that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) include the identification and evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives that are designed to reduce the significant environmental impacts of a project while still meeting the general project objectives. The CEQA Guidelines also set forth the intent and extent of alternatives analysis to be provided in an EIR. Those considerations are discussed below.

### ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

*An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparable merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decisionmaking and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.*

### PURPOSE

Section 15126.6(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

*Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment, the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, or would be more costly.*

### SELECTION OF A REASONABLE RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES

Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

*The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.*

## **PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

As stated above, the range of potential alternatives to the proposed Healdsburg 2030 General Plan (hereinafter “proposed Project” or “proposed General Plan”) shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the proposed General Plan. The objectives of the proposed General Plan are to:

- Update the Healdsburg General Plan to reflect the current status of such topics as hazards, infrastructure, public services and federal and state regulations
- Respond to new challenges and opportunities in directing future development
- Promote future land uses and development that are properly planned to preserve, protect and enhance Healdsburg’s small-town character and unique quality of life
- Provide for economic development that capitalizes on Healdsburg’s location and natural resource assets
- Provide community services and facilities

The proposed General Plan is also intended to accomplish the following objectives, as embodied in the proposed Guiding Principles in Table VI-1.

## **ALTERNATIVES REJECTED AS BEING INFEASIBLE**

As described above, Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination. Given the nature of the proposed General Plan (an update of the City of Healdsburg General Plan) an off-site alternative was not feasible.

In 2001, the City initiated a comprehensive revision of its General Plan. The City undertook the revision because the General Plan needed to be updated to reflect current conditions and new challenges and opportunities in directing future development. During the update process, the City discussed a variety of land use options based on current conditions and goals of the City and rejected options that did not meet the guiding principles. Based on the criteria listed above, the following alternatives have been determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives which have the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed General Plan but which may avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the proposed General Plan.

The City did not consider feasible an alternative which would reduce floor area ratios for potential commercial and industrial development and/or reduce residential densities because this type of alternative would negatively affect the community’s economic sustainability and could prevent the City from meeting its fair share of regional housing need. This alternative also would raise issues about the unconstitutional taking of property rights to the extent it deprived property owners of reasonable use of their properties.

**Table VI-1  
Proposed Healdsburg General Plan Guiding Principles**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Principle</b>
Identity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain Healdsburg's role within the region</li> <li>• Promote City-centered growth</li> <li>• Protect the City's scenic hillsides and ridgelines</li> <li>• Respect the City's past and its roots</li> <li>• Protect neighborhood character</li> <li>• Project and enhance the downtown and its plaza</li> <li>• Enhance gateways and strengthen primary corridors</li> <li>• Embrace the river</li> </ul>
Balance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Balance resident and visitor needs</li> <li>• Manage residential growth to ensure a measured pace of development</li> <li>• Promote a mix of housing types and affordable housing distributed throughout the community</li> <li>• Ensure that infrastructure and services keep pace with development</li> <li>• Maintain a jobs/housing balance</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect agricultural resources</li> <li>• Protect the environment</li> <li>• Foster principles of sustainability and conservation</li> <li>• Protect and enhance the natural habitat of Healdsburg's waterways</li> <li>• Preserve and enhance Healdsburg's urban forest</li> </ul>
Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote safe and convenient transportation alternatives</li> <li>• Promote connectivity among neighborhoods and throughout the city</li> <li>• Maintain and improve operation of the Healdsburg Municipal Airport</li> </ul>
Vitality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide an open and inviting business climate, a balanced economic environment, and a diverse tax base</li> <li>• Support local businesses and industries</li> <li>• Protect and enhance qualities that attract visitors to the city</li> </ul>
Livability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foster high quality design</li> <li>• Maximize opportunities for active and passive recreation</li> <li>• Promote educational opportunities</li> <li>• Meet health care needs</li> </ul>
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimize hazards to life and property</li> <li>• Protect and improve Healdsburg's acoustic environment</li> </ul>
<i>Source: Healdsburg 2030: General Plan Policy Document, City of Healdsburg, January 2009.</i>	

Several factors limit the extent to which a more drastic reduced density/reduced FAR alternative would lessen environmental effects of potential remaining development, including the nature of the city as largely built-out with somewhat limited remaining land available for development or redevelopment, the effects of the city's growth-management ordinance, which limits residential development on an annual basis, and the city's urban growth boundary.

As analyzed in this Revised DEIR, three of the four impacts for the proposed General Plan that are identified as significant and unavoidable are existing, with or without any additional development under

the current general plan, the proposed General Plan or any alternative. They are the air quality impacts resulting from unknown greenhouse gas effects, the impact on traffic circulation at the Dry Creek/101 interchange if Caltrans does not approve improvements, and the light and glare from the community ballfield and park approved as part of the Saggio Hills project. Therefore, a reduced FAR/reduced density alternative would not have the potential to reduce three of the four significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed General Plan to a less than significant level.

The potential incremental lessening of the traffic impact on the identified Highway 101 segments from even a greatly reduced density alternative is outweighed by the city's need to provide for its fair share of housing needs and sustain enough economic growth to preserve community vitality and the city's tax base, among other General Plan objectives and guiding principles.

## **OVERVIEW OF SELECTED ALTERNATIVES**

The five alternatives to be analyzed in comparison to the proposed General Plan are as follows:

No Project Alternative (current General Plan)

Alternative A: Quaker Hill Alternative

Alternative B: Chiquita Road Alternative

Alternative C: Nu Forest Products Alternative

Alternative D: Reduced SOI Alternative

As discussed in Section III (Project Description), buildout under the proposed General Plan could result in the construction of 872 residential units, approximately 1.1 million square feet of commercial space, approximately one million square feet of industrial development, and at least 339 hotel rooms. The No Project Alternative consists of development under the current General Plan. Under this Alternative, no changes would be made to the General Plan Land Use Map or to any land use designations. Additionally, no policies or implementation measures would be revised, deleted, or added to the General Plan.

All other alternatives include changes to the land use designations for specific parcels shown on the proposed General Plan Land Use Map. Table VI-2 shows the current land uses on these parcels, the land use designations under the proposed General Plan, and the alternative land use designations for Alternatives A, B, C and D. The differences in potential development between the proposed General Plan and the four alternatives are shown in Table VI-3. Additionally, a detailed description of each alternative is provided below.

## **ASSUMPTIONS AND METHODOLOGY**

A project may have the potential to generate significant impacts, but changes to certain features may also afford the opportunity to avoid or reduce such impacts. The alternatives analysis is presented as a comparative analysis to the proposed General Plan. The following alternatives analysis compares the potential significant environmental impacts of the five alternatives with those of the proposed General Plan for each of the environmental topics analyzed in detail in Section IV (Environmental Impact Analysis) of the Revised Draft EIR.

**Table VI-2  
Alternative Scenarios**

Alternative	Existing Uses of Site	Proposed General Plan		Alternative Scenario	
		Land Use Designation(s)	Potential Development	Land Use Designation(s)	Potential Development
<b>No Project: Current General Plan</b>	Multiple	Multiple	872 dwelling units 2.1 million sf commercial/industrial 339 hotel rooms	Multiple	872 dwelling units 1.8 million sf commercial/industrial 339 hotel rooms
<b>Alternative A: Quaker Hill</b>	Vacant	Industrial	394,131 sf industrial or business park <sup>1</sup>	Mixed Use	150 multi-family units 27,500 sf commercial 168 hotel rooms <sup>3</sup>
<b>Alternative B: Chiquita Road</b>	6 single-family homes	Industrial	85,686 sf industrial or business park <sup>2</sup>	Medium Density Residential	35 single-family units <sup>4</sup>
<b>Alternative C: Nu Forest Products</b>	Lumber mill	Industrial (6.75 acres) Mixed Use (1.8 acres)	No change assumed	Mixed Use	55 multi-family units <sup>5</sup> 111,730 sf commercial <sup>6</sup>
<b>Alternative D: Reduced SOI</b>	Rural residential, agriculture, reservoirs, conserved open space	Very Low Density Residential Open Space Public/Quasi Public	58 dwelling units	Resources and Rural Development (Sonoma County)	No development within SOI

*Notes:*

- <sup>1</sup> Based on FAR of 0.50 applied to 30.16 acres, adjusted by 0.6.
- <sup>2</sup> Based on FAR of 0.50 applied to 6.50 acres, adjusted by 0.6.
- <sup>3</sup> Based on development scenario proposed by property owner.
- <sup>4</sup> Based on midpoint of MDR density range (4.50 upa) applied to 7 acres plus 3 additional units on properties currently developed with residences.
- <sup>5</sup> Based on midpoint of MU density range (13 upa) applied to 4.275 acres.
- <sup>6</sup> Based on FAR of 1.0 applied to 4.275 acres, adjusted by 0.6..

sf = square feet  
FAR = floor area ratio

Source: City of Healdsburg Planning & Building Department, January 2009.

**Table VI-3  
Comparison of Alternative Buildout Scenarios to Proposed General Plan Buildout**

	Proposed General Plan <sup>1,2</sup>	Alternative A Quaker Hill		Alternative B Chiquita Rd		Alternative C Nu Forest Products		Alternative D Reduced SOI	
	Potential Development	Change	Potential Development	Change	Potential Development	Change	Potential Development	Change	Potential Development
<b>Residential</b>									
Single-Family	578 units		578 units	<b>+35 units</b>	<b>613 units</b>		578 units	-58 units	520 units
Multi-Family	294 units	<b>+150 units</b>	<b>444 units</b>		294 units	<b>+55 units</b>	<b>349 units</b>		294 units
<b>Totals</b>	<i>872 units</i>		<b>1,022 units</b>		<b>907 units</b>		<b>927 units</b>		814 units
<b>Population</b>									
Population	2,268 residents	<b>+390 residents</b>	<b>2,658 residents</b>	<b>+91 residents</b>	<b>2,359 residents</b>	<b>+143 residents</b>	<b>2,411 residents</b>	-151 residents	2,117 residents
<b>Totals</b>	<i>2,268 residents</i>		<b>2,658 residents</b>		<b>2,359 residents</b>		<b>2,411 residents</b>		2,117 residents
<b>Commercial/Industrial</b>									
Commercial	1,094,191 sf <sup>2</sup>	<b>+27,500 sf</b>	<b>1,101,691 sf</b>		1,094,191 sf	<b>+111,730 sf</b>	<b>1,205,921 sf</b>		1,094,191 sf
Office	20,000 sf		20,000 sf		20,000 sf		20,000 sf		20,000 sf
Industrial	1,014,117 sf	-394,131 sf	619,986 sf	-85,686 sf	928,431 sf		1,014,117 sf		1,014,117 sf
<b>Totals</b>	<i>2,108,308 sf</i>		1,741,677 sf		2,022,622 sf		<b>2,240,038 sf</b>		2,108,308 sf
<b>Hotel</b>									
Hotel	339 rooms	<b>+168 rooms</b>	<b>507 rooms</b>		339 rooms		339 rooms		339 rooms
<b>Totals</b>	<i>339 rooms</i>		<b>507 rooms</b>		339 rooms		339 rooms		339 rooms

<sup>1</sup> From Table III-4

<sup>2</sup> Potential development under the existing General Plan (No Project Alternative) is identical to the proposed General Plan, except that potential commercial development is 269,774 square feet less

Notes: sf = square feet; Numbers in **bold** are greater than the proposed General Plan.

Source: City of Healdsburg Planning & Building Department, 2009.

## **NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE (CURRENT GENERAL PLAN)**

The No Project Alternative (current General Plan) represents the case in which the proposed General Plan is not adopted by the City of Healdsburg. In the absence of the proposed General Plan, the current General Plan, as amended through September 15, 2008, including its land use designations, densities and floor area ratios, would continue to guide the Planning Area's development. Under the No Project Alternative, a lower amount of commercial space (269,774 square feet less) could be developed, as the floor area ratio (FAR) for the proposed Mixed Use (MU) designation (formerly Highway Commercial [HC]) would not be increased from 0.5 to 1.0, and the Service Commercial (SC) floor area ratio would not be increased from 0.5 to 0.8. The amount of potential residential units, industrial development, and hotel units would be unchanged.

Under the No Project Alternative, the text of the General Plan Background Report and Policy Document would not be revised to reflect changed conditions; the Policy Document would continue to include unnecessary land use designations; policies and implementation programs would not be revised to include standards or be redefined to strengthen and clarify their intent or to reflect Zoning Ordinance regulations; and the Policy Document would continue to include policies and implementation programs that are either no longer applicable or are implemented through another policy or agency.

The following might not occur under the No Project Alternative because the city would not be committed to these actions through the adoption of the proposed General Plan's policies and implementation programs:

- Installation of traffic calming measures
- Development of commercial/residential mixed use projects instead of highway commercial uses
- Revitalization of the city's gateways
- Development in proximity to the rail depot in support of transit use
- Development of a designated multi-modal transit center
- Public access to Foss Creek and the Russian River
- Revision of the noise ordinance to further protect noise-sensitive uses
- Protection of residential uses in and near commercial areas from negative impacts
- Prohibition of big box retail and outlet malls
- Promotion of downtown diversity by regulating formula businesses

## **ALTERNATIVE A: QUAKER HILL ALTERNATIVE**

The Quaker Hill Alternative site is located within development Sub-Area D (refer to Figure VI-1 and Figure III-3) of the General Plan Planning Area and is listed as D-1 within the potential proposed General Plan development areas (refer to Appendix C). Currently, this 30.16-acre site, located within the northwestern-most region of the Planning Area, is vacant and undeveloped (refer to Figure VI-2 for views of the site). The current General Plan designates this site as Heavy Industrial (refer to Figure III-4). As

part of the proposed General Plan, all properties currently designated Light Industrial and Heavy Industrial would be reclassified to a new Industrial land use category. Under the proposed General Plan, therefore, the Quaker Hill site is proposed for designation as Industrial, with a potential development of 394,131 square feet of industrial space. This calculation was based on a FAR of 0.50, which was applied to the 30.16-acre site and adjusted by 0.6.

Under Alternative A, the entire Quaker Hill site would continue to be available for development. However, the site's land use designation would be Mixed Use instead of Industrial. Therefore, instead of the potential development of 394,131 industrial square feet at the Quaker Hill site, the development potential under the Mixed Use designation could include residential and/or commercial uses. For the purposes of this analysis, the following development of the property was assumed for this alternative:

- 150 multi-family dwelling units, with an associated population of 390 residents, based on 2.6 persons per household;
- 27,500 square feet of commercial space; and
- 168 hotel rooms.

This shift in land use designation from Industrial to Mixed Use would change the overall buildout characteristics proposed under the proposed General Plan. Specifically, in comparison with the proposed General Plan, Alternative A buildout could result in the construction of 150 additional dwelling units (1,022 units vs. 872 additional units), 366,631 square feet less of commercial and/or industrial development (approximately 1.7 million square feet vs. 2.1 million square feet), and 168 additional hotel rooms (507 rooms vs. 339 additional rooms).

## **ALTERNATIVE B: CHIQUITA ROAD ALTERNATIVE**

The Chiquita Road Alternative includes seven properties totaling 8.68 acres located within development Sub-Area D (refer to Figure VI-1 and Figure III-3) of the General Plan Planning Area and is identified as Number D-15 of the proposed General Plan development areas (refer to Appendix C). Currently, properties fronting Chiquita Road are occupied with six single-family residential homes (refer to Figure VI-3 for views of the site). Per the current General Plan, the site is designated as Light Industrial. As part of the amendments included in the proposed General Plan, all properties currently designated Light Industrial and Heavy Industrial would be reclassified to a new Industrial land use category. Therefore, under the proposed General Plan, the properties would be designated for industrial uses. The development potential under this designation would include 85,686 square feet of industrial uses, based on a floor area ratio of 0.50, which was applied to the 8.68 acres and adjusted by 0.6. This estimate assumes that the existing residences would remain.

Under Alternative B, the existing residences would remain and all of the Chiquita Road properties would be redesignated as Medium Density Residential. The Medium Density Residential development potential for Alternative B would include an additional 35 single-family dwelling units. This calculation was based on a midpoint of the Medium Density Residential density range (4.50 units per acre) applied to 6.56 acres



**Figure VI-1 Alternative Sites Map: Quaker Hill and Chiquita Road Sites**

**This page intentionally left blank.**

**Figure VI-2 Views of the Quaker Hill Site**

**This page intentionally left blank.**

**Figure VI-3 Views of Chiquita Road Site**

**This page intentionally left blank.**

(the five properties not fronting Chiquita Road), plus three additional units on properties currently developed with residences. The 35 dwelling units would have a potential population of 91 residents based on 2.6 persons per household.

This shift in land use designation from Industrial to Medium Density Residential would change the overall buildout characteristics proposed under the proposed General Plan. Specifically, in comparison with the proposed General Plan, Alternative B buildout could result in the construction of 35 more dwelling units at buildout (907 units vs. 872 additional units), 85,686 square feet less of commercial and/or industrial development (approximately 2 million square feet vs. 2.1 million additional square feet at buildout), and 91 more residents at buildout (2,359 vs. 2,268 additional residents).

### **ALTERNATIVE C: NU FOREST PRODUCTS ALTERNATIVE**

The Nu Forest Products Alternative site is located within development Sub-Area I (refer to Figure VI-4 and Figure III-3 for reference) of the proposed General Plan Planning Area. This 8.55-acre site is designated by the current General Plan as Highway Commercial (1.8 acres) and Light Industrial (6.75 acres) and is developed with a lumber mill and associated improvements (refer to Figure VI-5 for views of the site). As part of the proposed General Plan, all properties currently designated Highway Commercial would be reclassified to a new Mixed Use land use category, and all properties currently designated Light Industrial would be reclassified to a new Industrial land use category. Therefore under the proposed General Plan, the site would be designated a combination of Mixed Use and Industrial. Additionally, under the proposed General Plan, the existing lumber yard would remain and no further development would be assumed to take place at this particular site.

Alternative C assumes that the entire Nu Forest Products site would be redesignated as Mixed Use and redeveloped (including the removal of the existing lumber yard). For the purposes of this analysis, it was assumed that half of the site would be developed with multi-family housing and half would be developed with commercial uses. The development potential under this alternative would include 55 multi-family dwelling units and 111,730 square feet of commercial space. The number of dwelling units were estimated by utilizing the midpoint of the Mixed Use density range (approximately 13 units per acre), and applying that to half of the site (4.275 acres). The commercial square footage was estimated based on a floor area ratio of 1.0 applied to 4.275 acres, and adjusted by 0.6. This shift in land use from a Mixed Use and Industrial combination to an overall Mixed Use designation could result in the construction of 55 additional dwelling units at buildout (927 units vs. 872 additional units), and 111,730 square feet more of commercial/industrial development (approximately 2.2 million square feet vs. 2.1 million additional square feet at buildout) compared to the proposed General Plan. The 55 dwelling units could add 143 more residents based on 2.6 persons per household at buildout (2,411 vs. 2,268 additional residents).

### **ALTERNATIVE D: REDUCED SOI ALTERNATIVE**

The Reduced Sphere of Influence (SOI) Alternative site involves approximately 280 acres in Sub-Area B of the Planning Area. Sub-Area B is not located within the city limits, but is within the SOI of the city.

**This page intentionally left blank.**



**Figure VI-4 Alternative Sites Map: NuForest Site**

**This page intentionally left blank.**

**Figure VI-5 Views of the NuForest site**

**This page intentionally left blank.**

All of the area outside the city limits and within the SOI is currently governed by the Sonoma County General Plan, which presently designates this area as Resources and Rural Development (one dwelling unit per 20 acres).

The ownership, uses and land use designations under the proposed General Plan for Sub-Area B are summarized in Table VI-4.

**Table VI-4  
Sub-Area B Summary**

APN	Owner	Acreage	Use	Land Use Designation(s) <sup>1</sup>
091-040-010	Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District	40.28	Healdsburg Ridge Open Space Preserve	Open Space
091-040-050		55.47		
091-040-100	Raja Development	119.41 41.27	Conservation easement Vacant	Open Space Very Low Density Residential
091-040-003	City of Healdsburg	2.73	Reservoir	Public/Quasi-Public
091-040-017	City of Healdsburg	.03	Well	Public/Quasi-Public
091-040-036	Romero	1.00	Single-family dwelling	Very Low Density Residential
091-040-042	Draycott	13.75	Vineyard	Very Low Density Residential
091-040-099	City of Healdsburg	3.53	Reservoir	Public/Quasi-Public
003-210-010	City of Healdsburg	2.25	Vacant (future right-of- way)	Public/Quasi-Public
<sup>1</sup> Per proposed General Plan				

The only developable portion of Sub-Area B is 41.27 acres of the 160.68-acre Raja Development property; the remainder of this property is in a conservation easement granted to the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District. The 41.27 acres are divided among three separate enclaves, two of which are contiguous to the city limits. All three areas have multiple, significant environmental constraints.

Under the proposed General Plan, Sub-Area B would be allowed to annex into the city following the preparation of a specific or area plan and environmental review. Potential development under the proposed General Plan is estimated at 58 dwelling units, constructed on one or more of the three enclaves.

Under Alternative D, the SOI would be retracted, removing Sub-Area B from the SOI, and with it the possibility of annexation of this area to the city. Therefore, this area would remain governed by the Sonoma County General Plan, which would allow the development of up to two dwelling units on the site. The reduction in developable area under this alternative would result in the construction of 58 fewer dwelling units at buildout (814 units vs. 872 additional units) within the Healdsburg Planning Area,

compared to the proposed General Plan, and 151 fewer residents at buildout (2,117 vs. 2,268 additional residents).

## COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

This section presents the potential environmental impacts for each alternative by environmental issue area, in comparison to the proposed General Plan.

### Aesthetics

No Project Alternative. Commercial development under the No Project Alternative would be less than under the proposed General Plan, potentially resulting in less alteration of scenic vistas and visual character of the city than under the Proposed General Plan. The new policies that are included in the proposed General Plan to protect scenic resources and visual character would not be implemented under the No Project Alternative; however, there are policies in the existing General Plan that provide protection. Therefore, potential aesthetics impacts under the No Project Alternative would be slightly less than those outlined for the proposed General Plan, and would remain at a *less than significant* level. However, the potential impact related to light and glare at the Saggio Hills community park would remain at a *significant and unavoidable level*.

Quaker Hill Alternative. The construction of residential and commercial structures on the Quaker Hill site, which is located within the viewshed of two scenic roads (U.S. Highway 101, Healdsburg Avenue), would likely be more attractive than the industrial development planned for the site by the proposed General Plan. Therefore, potential aesthetics impacts under Alternative A would be somewhat less than those outlined for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level. However, the potential impact related to light and glare at the Saggio Hills community park would remain at a *significant and unavoidable level*.

Chiquita Road Alternative. The construction of residential structures on the Chiquita Road site, which is located within the viewshed of two scenic roads (U.S. Highway 101, Healdsburg Avenue), would likely be more attractive than the industrial development planned for the site by the proposed General Plan. Therefore, potential aesthetics impacts under Alternative B would be somewhat less than those outlined for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level. However, the potential impact related to light and glare at the Saggio Hills community park would remain at a *significant and unavoidable level*.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. The construction of residential and commercial structures on the Nu Forest Products site, which is located within the viewshed of a scenic road (Healdsburg Avenue), would likely be more attractive than the existing industrial uses that would likely continue under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, potential aesthetics impacts under Alternative C would be somewhat less than those outlined for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level. However, the

potential impact related to light and glare at the Saggio Hills community park would remain at a ***significant and unavoidable level***.

Reduced SOI Alternative. Due to the elimination of most development within the undeveloped Sub-Area B under this alternative, potential impacts related to scenic vistas and visual character under Alternative D would be significantly less than those outlined for the proposed General Plan, thus remaining at a ***less than significant*** level. However, the potential impact related to light and glare at the Saggio Hills community park would remain at a ***significant and unavoidable level***.

### **Agricultural Resources**

No Project Alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, the 16.33-acre parcel located between Magnolia and Kinley Drive would remain zoned Agriculture, a zoning designation that allows agricultural operations on the property. Under the proposed General Plan this parcel would be designated as Open Space. However, the Open Space designation allows agricultural and other open space uses, residential uses at a density of up to 0.20 dwelling units per gross acre and industrial uses directly related to on-site agricultural uses. Therefore, potential impacts to agricultural resources under the No Project Alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***less than significant*** level.

Quaker Hill Alternative. This site is not located within or in the immediate vicinity of prime farmland, unique farmland, or General Plan-designated Agriculture/Open Space land. Therefore, potential impacts to agricultural resources under Alternative A would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***less than significant*** level.

Chiquita Road Alternative. This site is not located within or in the immediate vicinity of prime farmland, unique farmland, or General Plan-designated Agriculture/Open Space land. Therefore, potential impacts to agricultural resources under Alternative B would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***less than significant*** level.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. This site is not located within or in the immediate vicinity of prime farmland, unique farmland, or General Plan-designated Agriculture/Open Space land. Therefore, potential impacts to agricultural resources under Alternative C would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***less than significant*** level.

Reduced SOI Alternative. Due to the substantial reduction in potential residential development in Sub-Area B, which includes vineyards, potential impacts to agricultural resources under Alternative D would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***less than significant*** level.

### **Air Quality**

No Project Alternative. Air quality impacts from buildout development under the No Project Alternative would be those associated with traffic generation from residential, commercial, and industrial

development allowed under the current General Plan. Buildout development under this alternative would be slightly less than under the proposed General Plan resulting in slightly fewer construction and vehicle trip ends per day and during the evening peak hour. As shown in Table VI-6, the No Project Alternative would generate 11,956 fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed Project. This decrease in construction and trips would result in slightly lower construction emissions and vehicle emissions than the proposed General Plan. However, similar to the proposed project, the No Project Alternative cannot be determined with a reasonable degree of certainty to not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change. Therefore, potential air quality impacts under the No Project Alternative would be slightly less than those identified for the proposed General Plan but would remain at a ***significant-and-unavoidable*** level.

Quaker Hill Alternative. The potential SOI population at buildout under Alternative A would be 14,858 residents, a 3.2 percent increase in population over the proposed Project projection. As shown in Table VI-6, Alternative A would also generate 831 more daily vehicle trips than the proposed Project. It is anticipated that the emissions under Alternative A would be slightly higher than those under the proposed Project given the higher population and vehicle trips. Similar to the proposed project, the Quaker Hill Alternative cannot be determined with a reasonable degree of certainty to not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change. Therefore, potential air quality impacts under Alternative A would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***significant and unavoidable*** level.

Chiquita Road Alternative. The potential SOI population at buildout under Alternative B would be 14,559 residents, a 0.7 percent increase in population over the proposed Project projection. As shown in Table VI-6, Alternative B would also generate 262 fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed Project. Therefore, it is anticipated that these minor differences in land uses under Alternative B would result in similar emissions as the proposed Project. Similar to the proposed project, the Chiquita Road Alternative cannot be determined with a reasonable degree of certainty to not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change. Therefore, potential air quality impacts under Alternative B would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***significant and unavoidable*** level.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. The potential SOI population at buildout under Alternative C would be 14,611 residents, a 1.1 percent increase in population over the proposed Project projection. As shown in Table VI-6, Alternative C would also generate 5,313 more daily vehicle trips than the proposed Project. Alternative C is anticipated to result in slightly higher emissions than the proposed Project. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative C cannot be determined with a reasonable degree of certainty to not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change. Therefore, potential air quality impacts under Alternative C would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***significant and unavoidable*** level.

Reduced SOI Alternative. The potential SOI population at buildout under Alternative D would be 14,317 residents, a 1.3 percent decrease in population over the proposed Project projections. As shown in Table



VI-6, Alternative D would also generate 555 fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative D would result in slightly fewer emissions than the proposed Project. However, similar to the proposed project, the Reduced SOI Alternative cannot be determined with a reasonable degree of certainty to not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change. Therefore, air quality impacts under Alternative D would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***significant and unavoidable*** level.

### **Biological Resources**

No Project Alternative. Full buildout under the No Project Alternative could result in a slightly less amount of commercial development than the proposed Project. Therefore, the potential impact to biological resources under the No Project Alternative would be slightly lower than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***less than significant*** level.

Quaker Hill Alternative. Although under Alternative A the shift in land use designation from Industrial to Mixed Use would change the overall buildout characteristics from those proposed under the proposed General Plan, the developable acreage proposed in the proposed General Plan would remain the same, and the entire Quaker Hill site would continue to be available for development. As such, the biological impacts associated with developing these properties were included as part of the proposed Project impact analysis (refer to Section IV.E [Biological Resources]). As a result, potential Alternative A biological resources impacts would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***less than significant*** level.

Chiquita Road Alternative. Although under Alternative B the shift in land use designation from Industrial to Medium Density Residential would change the overall buildout characteristics from those proposed under the proposed General Plan, the developable acreage proposed in the proposed General Plan would remain the same, and the entire Chiquita Road site would continue to be developed. As such, the biological impacts associated with developing this portion of city land were included as part of the proposed Project impact analysis (refer to Section IV.E [Biological Resources]). As a result, potential Alternative B biological resources impacts would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***less than significant*** level.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. Although under Alternative C the shift in land use designation from Mixed Use and Industrial to Mixed Use would change the overall buildout characteristics from those proposed under the proposed General Plan, the entire NuForest site is currently developed or disturbed and would continued to be utilized through redevelopment. As such, the biological impacts associated with the potential redevelopment of the site were included as part of the proposed Project impact analysis (refer to Section IV.E [Biological Resources]). As a result, Alternative C biological resources impacts would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***less than significant*** level.

Reduced SOI Alternative. The biological impacts associated with development in Sub-Area B were included as part of the proposed Project impact analysis (refer to Section IV.E [Biological Resources]). As Alternative D includes the reduction of development within the undisturbed portion of Sub-Area B, potential Alternative D biological resources impacts would be less than those discussed for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less-than-significant* level.

### **Cultural Resources**

No Project Alternative. Full buildout under the No Project Alternative would result in a slightly lower amount of commercial development than the proposed Project. Therefore, the potential impact to cultural resources under the No Project Alternative would be slightly less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Quaker Hill Alternative. Although previously developed with a lumber mill, all structures and improvements have been removed and the Quaker Hill site is currently undeveloped; no historic buildings exist on-site. Furthermore, the Quaker Hill site is not located within a Historic District Overlay area. Therefore, cultural resources impacts under Alternative A would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Chiquita Road Alternative. Under Alternative B, the existing residences at the Chiquita Road site would remain. Proposed General Plan goals, policies, and measures would be implemented to minimize any impacts to cultural resources. The Chiquita Road site is not located within a Historic District Overlay area. Therefore, cultural resources impacts under Alternative B would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. Under Alternative C, the existing lumber yard would be removed. This lumber yard is not considered a historical resource, and the site is not located within a Historic District Overlay area. Therefore, cultural resources impacts under Alternative C would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Reduced SOI Alternative. As Alternative D includes the reduction of development within the undisturbed Sub-Area B, fewer ground-disturbing activities would occur. Therefore, cultural resources impacts under Alternative D would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

### **Geology/Soils**

No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would result in a slightly lower amount of development than the proposed Project and, therefore, fewer construction and development activities than under the proposed General Plan. The policies included in the proposed General Plan to prevent loss of lives, injury, and property damage due to geological hazards or earthquakes would not be implemented under the No Project Alternative; however, there are policies in the existing General Plan that provide

protection. Therefore, potential geology/soils impacts under the No Project Alternative would be slightly less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Quaker Hill Alternative. Under Alternative A, the amount of developable area would remain the same as the proposed Project. Although different building types could be constructed on the site, construction and development activities, as well as the associated geology/soils impacts, under Alternative A would be similar to those outlined for the proposed Project. With the additional dwelling units proposed under Alternative A, additional residents could be exposed to geology/soils hazards. However, with the implementation measures included in the proposed Project, potential geology/soils impacts under Alternative A would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Chiquita Road Alternative. Under Alternative B, the amount of developable area would remain the same as the proposed Project. Although different building types could be constructed on the site, construction and development activities, as well as the associated geology/soils impacts, under Alternative B would be similar to those outlined for the proposed Project. With the additional dwelling units proposed under Alternative B, additional residents could be exposed to geology/soils hazards. However, with the implementation measures included in the proposed Project, potential geology/soils impacts under Alternative B would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. Under Alternative C, the amount of developable area would be slightly greater than the proposed Project, specifically with the redevelopment of the Nu Forest existing lumberyard. This redevelopment would result in earthmoving and construction activities that would not be undertaken under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, construction and development activities under Alternative C would be slightly greater than those outlined for the proposed Project. The additional dwelling units proposed under Alternative C could result in the exposure of additional residents to geologic and soils hazards. However, with the implementation measures included in the proposed Project, potential geology/soils impacts under Alternative C would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Reduced SOI Alternative. Alternative D proposes less development and, therefore, fewer construction and development activities than under the proposed General Plan. With the reduction in dwelling units proposed under Alternative D, fewer residents would be exposed to geologic and soils hazards. Therefore, potential geology/soils impacts under Alternative D would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

### **Hazards & Hazardous Materials**

No Project Alternative. Potential development under the No Project Alternative would be slightly less than under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous

materials under the No Project Alternative would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and would remain at a *less than significant* level.

Quaker Hill Alternative. Due to a decrease in industrial square footage under Alternative B, potential impacts related to the additional transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials, as well as upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be slightly less than the proposed Project. Therefore, potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials under Alternative B would be slightly less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Chiquita Road Alternative. Due to a decrease in industrial square footage under Alternative C, potential impacts related to the additional transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials, as well as upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be slightly less than the proposed Project. Therefore, potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials under Alternative C would be slightly less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. Existing industrial uses would be replaced with residential and commercial uses under Alternative C. Therefore, potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials under Alternative C would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Reduced SOI Alternative. Sub-Area B is located in an area of high wildland fire hazard. The construction of fewer homes in this area, as proposed under this alternative, would significantly reduce this hazard. Therefore, potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials under Alternative D would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

## **Hydrology & Water Quality**

No Project Alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, earth-moving activities and operational impacts would be slightly less than the proposed Project. Furthermore, potential impacts on groundwater depletion or recharge, drainage pattern alteration, drainage system capacity, and change in the impervious surfaces under the No Project Alternative would be slightly less than the proposed Project as a result of the reduction in development. Therefore, potential hydrology and water quality impacts under the No Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Quaker Hill Alternative. Under Alternative A, construction, earth-moving activities and operational impacts would be similar to the proposed Project, as only the type of potential land uses would change. Potential impacts on groundwater depletion or recharge, drainage pattern alteration, and drainage system capacity would also be similar to the proposed Project. The creation of impervious surfaces would also be similar under this alternative in comparison with the proposed Project. Therefore, hydrology and

water quality impacts under Alternative A would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Chiquita Road Alternative. Under Alternative B, construction, earth-moving activities and operational impacts would be similar to the proposed Project, as only the type of potential land uses would change. Further, impacts from groundwater depletion or recharge, drainage pattern alteration, drainage system capacity, and change in the impervious surfaces would also be similar to the proposed Project. Therefore, potential hydrology and water quality impacts under Alternative B would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. Given the existing development over much of this site, impacts on groundwater depletion or recharge, drainage pattern alteration, drainage system capacity, and change in the impervious surfaces under Alternative C would be similar to the proposed Project. Therefore, potential hydrology and water quality impacts under Alternative C would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Reduced SOI Alternative. Under Alternative D, earth-moving activities and operational impacts would be less than the proposed Project. Further, impacts on groundwater depletion or recharge, drainage pattern alteration, drainage system capacity, and change in the impervious surfaces under Alternative D would be less than the proposed Project as a result of the reduction in development. Therefore, potential hydrology and water quality impacts under Alternative D would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

### **Land Use & Planning**

No Project Alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, no changes would be made to the current General Plan Land Use Map to redesignate any parcels, or combine land use designations. Additionally, no policies would be revised, deleted, or added to the current General Plan. Buildout would continue utilizing the existing land use designations. Overall, the potential buildout under the No Project Alternative would be slightly less than the proposed General Plan. However, under this alternative, the supplemental policies that promote compatibility between uses proposed under the proposed General Plan would not be implemented. Therefore, potential land use impacts under the No Project Alternative would be slightly greater than those identified for the proposed General Plan; however, they would still remain at a *less than significant* level.

Quaker Hill Alternative. A slightly greater density of development could result under Alternative A compared to the proposed General Plan. However, residential, hotel and retail uses would likely be more compatible with future residential development to the east and existing residences to the southeast than the industrial uses planned for the site by the proposed General Plan. These uses would also be sufficiently buffered from industrial (winery) uses to the south by distance and vegetation. Therefore, potential land use impacts under Alternative A would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Chiquita Road Alternative. Residential development under Alternative B would be more compatible with nearby residential land uses than would industrial uses. In addition, this development would occur at a density in line with nearby uses. These uses would also be sufficiently buffered from industrial (winery) uses to the north by distance and vegetation. Therefore, potential land use impacts under Alternative B would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. Redevelopment of the existing Nu Forest lumber yard with a combination of residential and commercial uses would improve the site's compatibility with surrounding land uses, which include mixed use and residential. Therefore, potential land use impacts under Alternative C would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Reduced SOI Alternative. Under Alternative D, the proposed development and annexation of Sub-Area B would not occur; thus this area would continue to be governed by the Sonoma County General Plan. With the reduction in development within this sub-area, the existing uses would remain primarily dedicated to open space, rural residential, and agriculture. Therefore, potential land use impacts under Alternative D would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

## Mineral Resources

No Project Alternative. Similar to the proposed General Plan, gravel mining of lands owned by Syar Industries adjacent to the Russian River, which include a state-designated Mineral Resource Zone-2, would be allowed to continue under the No Project Alternative. Therefore, potential mineral resources impacts under the No Project Alternative would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Quaker Hill Alternative. The Quaker Hill site is not located within or in the vicinity of the state-designated Mineral Resource Zone-2 site within the city. Therefore, potential mineral resources impacts under Alternative A would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Chiquita Road Alternative. The Chiquita Road site is not located within or in the vicinity of the state-designated Mineral Resource Zone-2 within the city. Therefore, potential mineral resources impacts under Alternative B would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. The NuForest site is not located within or in the vicinity of the state-designated Mineral Resource Zone-2 within the city. Therefore, potential mineral resources impacts under Alternative C would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Reduced SOI Alternative. Sub-Area B is not located within or in the vicinity of the state-designated Mineral Resource Zone-2 within the city. Further, areas within the city have not been delineated as locally-important mineral resource recovery sites in the proposed General Plan, subsequent specific plans, or other land use plans. Therefore, potential mineral resources impacts under Alternative D would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

## Noise

No Project Alternative. Full buildout under the No Project Alternative would result in a slightly lower amount of development than the proposed Project. However, residences, businesses, and noise-sensitive land uses located adjacent to potential development sites would still be affected by construction noise. Noise-sensitive developments near the railroad would also continue to be exposed to ground-borne vibration levels. However, no new noise-sensitive uses would be planned in areas within the 60 or 65 dBA CNEL noise contours for the city or county airports. Potential noise impacts related to established plans and noise ordinances, ground-borne vibration, and public use airports would be slightly lower than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Although there would be a slightly less amount of development, noise related to traffic would still increase substantially along major roadways throughout the city and result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above existing levels. As this impact lacks feasible mitigation for both the No Project Alternative and the proposed General Plan, potential noise impacts under the No Project Alternative would be slightly less than those identified for the proposed General Plan, but would remain at a *significant and unavoidable* level.

Quaker Hill Alternative A slightly greater density of development could result under Alternative A compared to the proposed General Plan. However, residential, hotel and retail uses would likely have fewer potential noise impacts than the industrial uses planned for the site by the proposed General Plan, potential noise impacts related to established plans and noise ordinances, ground-borne vibration, and public use airports would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Although Alternative A would result in fewer PM peak traffic trips (4,211 vs. 4,353) at buildout, impacts related to a permanent increase in noise would be similar to the proposed Project due to the lack of feasible mitigation. Therefore, potential noise impacts under Alternative A would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *significant and unavoidable* level.

Chiquita Road Alternative. Residential uses would generate less noise than the industrial uses planned for the site by the proposed General Plan. Therefore, potential noise impacts related to established plans and noise ordinances, ground-borne vibration, and public use airports would be the same as those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Although Alternative B would result in fewer PM peak traffic trips (4,304 vs. 4,353) at buildout, impacts related to a permanent increase in noise would be similar to the proposed Project due to the lack of feasible mitigation. Therefore, potential noise impacts under Alternative B would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***significant and unavoidable*** level.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. Residential and commercial uses would generate less noise than the continuation of industrial uses on this site, as proposed by the proposed General Plan. Therefore potential noise impacts related to established plans and noise ordinances, ground-borne vibration, and public use airports would be less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***less than significant*** level.

Alternative C would result in more daily vehicle trips (61,772 vs. 56,459) and PM peak traffic trips (4,688 vs. 4,353) than the proposed General Plan and impacts related to a permanent increase in noise related to traffic would be similar to the proposed General Plan due to the lack of feasible mitigation. Therefore, potential noise impacts under Alternative C would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***significant and unavoidable*** level.

Reduced SOI Alternative. Under Alternative D, the developable buildout area would be decreased compared to the proposed Project, specifically within Sub-Area B. As this alternative would significantly reduce potential development within a minimally-developed area, potential noise impacts related to established plans and noise ordinances, ground-borne vibration, and public use airports would be slightly less than under the proposed Project. Therefore, potential impacts would remain at a ***less than significant*** level.

Alternative D would result in fewer daily vehicle trips (55,904 vs. 56,459) and fewer PM peak traffic trips (4,294 vs. 4,353) at buildout; therefore, impacts related to a permanent increase in noise related to traffic would be slightly less than those identified for the proposed General Plan. However, impacts would still remain ***significant and unavoidable*** due to lack of feasible mitigation.

## **Population and Housing**

In the year 2007, the City's SOI contained approximately 4,654 housing units and in the year 2005, the City's SOI population was 12,200 residents. Table VI-5 shows the additional housing units and population that could result under each alternative, compared to the proposed project.

No Project Alternative. Buildout under the No Project Alternative could result in the construction of 872 dwelling units, the same as for the proposed Project. Therefore, potential population and housing impacts under the No Project Alternative would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a ***less than significant*** level.

Quaker Hill Alternative. Buildout under Alternative A could result in the construction of 1,022 dwelling units. Therefore, the potential SOI population would be 14,858 residents, a 21.8 percent increase in



population over 2005 conditions, compared to an 18.6 percent increase under the proposed General Plan. However, this growth would not be substantial, would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people. Therefore, potential population and housing impacts under Alternative A would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

**Table VI-5  
Comparison of Housing and Population to  
Proposed General Plan**

	<b>Additional Housing Units</b>	<b>Additional Population</b>
<i>Proposed General Plan</i>	872	14,468
No Project Alternative	0	0
Alternative A: Quaker Hill	<b>+150</b>	<b>+390</b>
Alternative B: Chiquita Road	<b>+35</b>	<b>+91</b>
Alternative C: Nu Forest Products	<b>+55</b>	<b>+143</b>
Alternative D: Reduced SOI	-58	-151
<i>Notes: Items in bold are greater than the proposed General Plan.</i>		

Chiquita Road Alternative. Buildout under Alternative B could result in the construction of 907 dwelling units. The potential SOI population at buildout would be 14,559 residents, a 19.3 percent increase in population over 2005 conditions, compared to an 18.6 percent increase under the proposed General Plan. However, this growth would not be substantial, would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people. Therefore, potential population and housing impacts under Alternative B would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. Buildout under Alternative C could result in the construction of 927 dwelling units. The potential SOI population at buildout under Alternative C would be 14,628 residents, a 19.7 percent increase in population over 2005 conditions, compared to an 18.6 percent increase under the proposed General Plan. However, this growth would not be substantial, would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people. Therefore, potential population and housing impacts under Alternative C would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

Reduced SOI Alternative. Alternative D buildout could result in the construction of 58 fewer dwelling units than under the proposed General Plan. Based on the reduction in dwelling units, the potential SOI population at buildout would be 14,317 residents, a 17.4 percent increase in population over 2005 conditions, compared to an 18.6 percent increase under the proposed Project. Overall, potential population and housing impacts under Alternative D would be slightly less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain at a *less than significant* level.

## Public Services

No Project Alternative. As the No Project Alternative could result in a lower amount of commercial development, the potential impact on all public services would be less than to those identified for the proposed Project. Therefore, potential public services impacts under the No Project Alternative would be less than those outlined under the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Quaker Hill Alternative. Alternative A would include a greater number of dwelling units (150 units), resulting in an increase in projected buildout population, and a slightly greater amount of commercial and hotel development than the proposed General Plan. However, the slightly greater impact on fire, police, schools, and park services would be partially offset by the lower amount of industrial development that would occur. Therefore, the potential impact on all public services would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Chiquita Road Alternative. Alternative B would include a slightly greater number of dwelling units (35 units), resulting in a slight increase in projected buildout population than the proposed General Plan. However, the slightly greater impact on fire, police, schools, and park services would be partially offset by the lower amount of industrial development that would occur. Therefore, the potential impact on all public services would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. Alternative C would include a slightly greater number of dwelling units (55 units), resulting in a slight increase in projected buildout population, and a slightly greater amount of commercial development than the proposed General Plan. However, the slightly greater impact on fire, police, schools, and park services would be partially offset by the reduction in industrial uses that would occur. Therefore, the potential impact on all public services would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Reduced SOI Alternative. Alternative D buildout could result in the construction of 58 fewer dwelling units than under the proposed General Plan, specifically within Sub-Area B. Under this alternative, the reduced buildout would result in population projections lower than the proposed Project, which would consequently lower overall impacts on public services. Therefore, potential public services impacts under Alternative D would be less than those outlined under the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

## Traffic/Circulation

A comparison of the Average Daily Trips (ADT) and PM Peak vehicle trips associated with each of the alternatives as compared to the proposed General Plan is shown below in Table VI-6.

No Project Alternative. Full buildout under the No Project Alternative would result in a slightly lower amount of development than the proposed Project and would therefore generate 11,956 fewer trips per day and 721 fewer trips during the evening peak hour than those estimated for the proposed General Plan

and would generate fewer pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders. Therefore, under the No Project Alternative, potential impacts related to intersections (with the exception of the Dry Creek Road/U.S. Highway 101 intersection), pedestrians, bicyclist, and transit would be slightly less than the proposed General Plan and would remain *less than significant*. Potential impacts related to parking, hazards, and air traffic would be the same as those of the proposed General Plan (i.e., *significant and unavoidable*).

**Table VI-6  
Comparison of Projected Future Trips to  
Proposed General Plan**

	Average Daily Trips (ADT)	PM Peak Trips
<i>Proposed General Plan</i>	56,459	4,353
No Project Alternative	-11,956	-731
Alternative A: Quaker Hill	<b>+831</b>	-142
Alternative B: Chiquita Road	-262	-49
Alternative C: Nu Forest Products	<b>+5,313</b>	<b>+335</b>
Alternative D: Reduced SOI	-555	-59
<i>Notes: Items in <b>bold</b> are greater than the proposed Project.</i>		
<i>Source: Trip Generation, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2003; compiled by Whitlock &amp; Weinberger Transportation, Inc.</i>		

However, cumulative impacts related to U.S. Highway 101 would still be considered *significant and unavoidable*, as no feasible mitigation measures are available to fully mitigate these impacts. Impacts on the Dry Creek Road/U.S. Highway 101 intersection would also still be considered *significant and unavoidable* if planned improvements are not supported by Caltrans. Therefore, the No Project Alternative's potential traffic and circulation impacts would still be the same (i.e., *significant and unavoidable*) as those associated with the proposed General Plan.

Quaker Hill Alternative. As shown in Table VI-6, Alternative A would generate 831 more daily vehicle trips but 142 fewer PM peak hour vehicle trips than the proposed General Plan. Therefore, Alternative A impacts related to intersections (with the exception of the Dry Creek Road/U.S. Highway 101 intersection) would be slightly less than the proposed General Plan and would remain *less than significant*. Alternative A would likely generate similar amounts of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders as the proposed General Plan. Parking needed for development could be accommodated on-site. Any new intersections or streets would be required to be designed to City standards. No development would occur within the flight path of the Healdsburg Municipal Airport. Therefore, Alternative A impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, parking, and hazards would be the same as the proposed General Plan (i.e., *less than significant*).

However, cumulative impacts related to U.S. Highway 101 would still be considered ***significant and unavoidable***, as no feasible mitigation measures are available to fully mitigate these impacts. Impacts on the Dry Creek Road/U.S. Highway 101 intersection would also still be considered ***significant and unavoidable*** if planned improvements are not supported by Caltrans. Therefore, Alternative A's potential traffic and circulation impacts would still be the same (i.e., ***significant and unavoidable***) as those associated with the proposed General Plan.

Chiquita Road Alternative. As shown in Table VI-6, Alternative B would generate 262 fewer daily vehicle trips and 49 fewer PM peak vehicle trips than the proposed General Plan. Therefore, Alternative B impacts related to intersections (with the exception of the Dry Creek Road/U.S. Highway 101 intersection) would be slightly less than the proposed General Plan and would remain ***less than significant***. Alternative B would likely generate similar amounts of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders as the proposed General Plan. Parking needed for development could be accommodated on-site. Any new intersections or streets would be required to be designed to City standards. No development would occur within the flight path of the Healdsburg Municipal Airport. Therefore, Alternative B impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, parking, and hazards would be the same as the proposed General Plan (i.e., ***less than significant***).

However, cumulative impacts related to U.S. Highway 101 would still be considered ***significant and unavoidable***, as no feasible mitigation measures are available to fully mitigate these impacts. Impacts on the Dry Creek Road/U.S. Highway 101 intersection would also still be considered ***significant and unavoidable*** if planned improvements are not supported by Caltrans. Therefore, Alternative B's potential traffic and circulation impacts would still be the same (i.e., ***significant and unavoidable***) as those associated with the proposed General Plan.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. Because the existing lumber mill operation generates a limited amount of traffic during the PM peak hour, and to provide a conservative assessment, no deduction was applied to reflect any existing trips that would be eliminated upon redevelopment of the site. As shown in Table VI-6, this alternative would generate significantly higher traffic volumes (i.e., 5,313 additional daily vehicle trips and 335 additional PM peak vehicle trips) than would be expected under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, potential impacts on intersections within the Planning Area were evaluated for Alternative C and mitigation measures identified to address these impacts.

*Impact VI-1: Implementation of Development under Alternative C would Result in Unacceptable Operating Conditions at Six of the Study Intersections*

Development under Alternative C would increase vehicular traffic and result in the need for capacity enhancements at six intersections to maintain acceptable operating conditions. These are the same six intersections that would require mitigation under the proposed General Plan. However, operating conditions under Alternative C would lead to deterioration in LOS at two of the intersections, as indicated in Table VI-7.

**Table VI-7  
Summary of Project and Alternative C Operation**

Intersection	Project Conditions		Alternative C Conditions		Alternative C Mitigations	
	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
18. Vine St/Matheson St (SIG)*	19.3	B	<b>57.7</b>	<b>E</b>	40.5	D
24. Healdsburg Ave-Vine St/Mill St (SIG)*	54.8	D	<b>60.5</b>	<b>E</b>	41.7	D
<i>Notes:</i> SIG=Signalized Intersection Results indicated in bold are unacceptable based on the applied operational standard. * Signalization provided by proposed General Plan policies and programs. Source: Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc., 2008.						

The following additional mitigation measures would be required to reduce Alternative C’s traffic impacts and to maintain acceptable operating conditions.

*Mitigation Measure VI-1a: Install traffic signals and associated lanes at the Dry Creek Road interchange*

In addition to the improvements included in the proposed General Plan for this intersection, the northbound Grove Street approach to Dry Creek Road would need to be modified to provide separate left-turn, through and right-turn lanes together with right-turn overlap phasing.

*Mitigation Measure VI-1b: Modify lane assignments and phasing at Vine Street/Matheson Street.*

In addition to the improvements included in the proposed General Plan for this intersection, the lane assignments on northbound Vine Street would need to be modified to provide a left-turn lane and shared through/right-turn lane in place of the existing shared left-turn/through lane and dedicated right-turn lane.

*Mitigation Measure VI-1c: Modify lane assignments at Healdsburg Avenue/Mill Street-Vine Street*

In addition to the improvements included in the proposed General Plan for this intersection, the lane assignments would need to be modified to allow left turns from both lanes on the eastbound approach, with the left-turn only lane directed to Vine Avenue, and access from the westbound Mill Street approach would need to be limited to right turns to maintain acceptable operating conditions under the traffic volumes anticipated with Land Use Alternative C.

Alternative C would likely generate greater amounts of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders than the proposed General Plan. However, sidewalks and bicycle ways would be required of any development. There is adequate capacity in the transit services to accommodate additional riders. Parking needed for development could be accommodated on-site. Any new intersections or streets would be required to be designed to City standards. No development would occur within the flight path of the Healdsburg

Municipal Airport. Therefore, Alternative C impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, parking, and hazards would be the same as the proposed General Plan (i.e., *less than significant*).

However, cumulative impacts related to U.S. Highway 101 would still be considered *significant and unavoidable*, as no feasible mitigation measures are available to fully mitigate these impacts. Impacts on the Dry Creek Road/U.S. Highway 101 intersection would also still be considered *significant and unavoidable* if planned improvements are not supported by Caltrans. Therefore, Alternative C's potential traffic and circulation impacts would still be the same (i.e., *significant and unavoidable*) as those associated with the proposed General Plan.

Reduced SOI Alternative. As shown in Table VI-6, Alternative D would generate 555 fewer daily vehicle trips and 59 fewer PM peak vehicle trips than the proposed General Plan. Therefore, Alternative DB impacts related to intersections (with the exception of the Dry Creek Road/U.S. Highway 101 intersection) would be slightly less than the proposed General Plan and would remain *less than significant*. Alternative D would generate fewer pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders than the proposed General Plan. Parking needed for development could be accommodated on-site. Any new intersections or streets would be required to be designed to City standards. No development would occur within the flight path of the Healdsburg Municipal Airport. Therefore, Alternative D impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, parking, and hazards would be the same as the proposed General Plan (i.e., *less than significant*).

However, cumulative impacts related to U.S. Highway 101 would still be considered *significant and unavoidable*, as no feasible mitigation measures are available to fully mitigate these impacts. Impacts on the Dry Creek Road/U.S. Highway 101 intersection would also still be considered *significant and unavoidable* if planned improvements are not supported by Caltrans. Therefore, Alternative D's potential traffic and circulation impacts would still be the same (i.e., *significant and unavoidable*) as those associated with the proposed General Plan.

## Utilities

A comparison of the wastewater generation, water demand, and solid waste generation associated with each of the alternatives to the proposed General Plan is shown in Table VI-8.

No Project Alternative. Buildout under the No Project Alternative would generate an estimated wastewater flow of 385,010 gallons per day (gpd), which is approximately 69,852 gpd less than under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, the No Project Alternative's potential wastewater impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Regarding water services, buildout under the No Project Alternative would have the same estimated water demand as under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, potential water service impacts for the No Project Alternative would be similar to those outlined for the proposed General Plan, i.e., *less than significant*.

**Table VI-8  
Comparison of Wastewater, Water, and Solid Waste Generation to  
Proposed General Plan**

	<b>Wastewater Generation</b>	<b>Water Demand</b>	<b>Solid Waste Generation</b>
<i>Proposed Project</i>	428,015 <sup>1</sup> gpd	3,372 afy	15.8 tpd
No Project Alternative	-69,852 gpd	0 afy	-1.75 tpd
Alternative A: Quaker Hill	<b>+12,341 gpd</b>	<b>+61.0 afy</b>	<b>+0.06 tpd</b>
Alternative B: Chiquita Road	-764 gpd	<b>+14.2 afy</b>	-0.06 tpd
Alternative C: Nu Forest Products	<b>+26,847 gpd</b>	<b>+22.4 afy</b>	<b>+1.04 tpd</b>
Alternative D: Reduced SOI	-9,529 gpd	-23.6 afy	-0.33 tpd
<i>Items in bold are greater than the proposed General Plan. gpd = gallons per day afy = acre feet per year tpd = tons per day</i>			

Under the No Project Alternative, the estimated solid waste generation would be less (i.e., 1.75 tons per day [tpd]) than the proposed General Plan due to a decrease in commercial uses. Therefore, the No Project Alternative's potential solid waste impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed General Plan and would remain *less than significant*.

The lower amount of commercial development under the No Project Alternative would use less electricity and natural gas than the proposed General Plan. Therefore, potential electrical and natural gas service impacts for the No Project Alternative would be less than those associated with the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Overall, the No Project Alternative's potential impacts to utilities would be slightly less than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Quaker Hill Alternative. Buildout under Alternative A would generate an estimated wastewater flow of 440,355 gpd within the city, which is approximately 12,341 gpd/.012 mgd (million gallons per day) greater than under the proposed General Plan. However, adequate wastewater treatment plant capacity is or will be available to accommodate this increase. Therefore, potential wastewater impacts for Alternative A would remain *less than significant*.

Regarding water services, buildout under Alternative A would generate an estimated water demand of approximately 3,433 afy, which is approximately 61 afy greater than under the proposed General Plan. However, total projected water demand under proposed General Plan buildout would leave a 103-afy surplus. Therefore, potential water service impacts for Alternative A would be similar to those outlined for the proposed General Plan, i.e., *less than significant*.

Under Alternative A, the estimated solid waste generation would be slightly greater (i.e., 0.06 tpd) than the proposed General Plan due to an increase in residential, commercial, and hotel land uses and a decrease in industrial uses. However, adequate capacity is available at affected landfills to accommodate this increase. Therefore, Alternative C's potential solid waste impacts would be similar to the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Alternative A would use similar amounts of electricity and natural gas as the proposed General Plan. Therefore, potential electrical and natural gas service impacts for Alternative A would remain *less than significant*.

Overall, Alternative A's potential impacts to utilities would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Chiquita Road Alternative. Buildout under Alternative B would generate an estimated wastewater flow of 427,251 gpd, which is approximately 764 gpd less than under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, Alternative B's potential wastewater impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Regarding water services, buildout under Alternative B would generate an estimated water demand of approximately 3,386.2 afy due to an increase in residential units, which is approximately 14.2 afy greater than under the proposed General Plan. However, total projected water demand under proposed General Plan buildout would leave a 103-afy surplus. Therefore, potential water service impacts for Alternative B would be similar to those outlined for the proposed General Plan, i.e., *less than significant*.

Under Alternative B, the estimated solid waste generation would be slightly less (i.e., 0.06 tpd) than the proposed General Plan due to an increase in residential land uses and a decrease in industrial uses. Therefore, Alternative B's potential solid waste impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Alternative B would use similar amounts of electricity and natural gas as the proposed General Plan. Therefore, potential electrical and natural gas service impacts for Alternative A would remain *less than significant*.

Overall, Alternative B's potential impacts to utilities would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Nu Forest Products Alternative. Buildout under Alternative C would generate an estimated wastewater flow of 423,366 gpd, which is approximately 26,897 gpd/.027 MGD more than under the proposed General Plan. However, adequate wastewater treatment plant capacity is or will be available to accommodate this increase. Therefore, potential wastewater impacts for Alternative C would remain *less than significant*.



Regarding water services, buildout under Alternative C would generate an estimated water demand of approximately 3,394.4 afy within the city, which is approximately 22.4 afy greater than under the proposed General Plan. However, total projected water demand under proposed General Plan buildout would leave a 103-afy surplus. Therefore, potential water service impacts for Alternative B would be similar to those outlined for the proposed General Plan, i.e., *less than significant*.

Under Alternative C, the estimated solid waste generation due to an increase in residential and commercial land uses and a decrease in industrial uses would be slightly greater (i.e., 1.04 tpd) than the proposed General Plan due to an increase in residential and commercial land uses. However, adequate capacity is available at affected landfills to accommodate this increase. Therefore, Alternative C's potential solid waste impacts would be similar to the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Alternative C would use slightly higher amounts of electricity and natural gas than the proposed General Plan. However, adequate capacity and supplies are or will be available to accommodate this increase. Therefore, potential electrical and natural gas service impacts for Alternative C would remain *less than significant*.

Overall, Alternative C's potential impacts to utilities would be similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Reduced SOI Alternative. Buildout under Alternative D would result in an estimated wastewater flow of 386,957 gpd within the Planning Area, which is 9,512 gpd less than under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, the No Project Alternative's potential wastewater impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Regarding water services, buildout under Alternative D would generate an estimated water demand of 3,348.4 afy within the city, which is approximately 23.6 afy less than under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, potential water service impacts for Alternative D would be less than those outlined for the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Under Alternative D, the estimated solid waste generation due to a decrease in residential uses would be slightly less (i.e., 0.33 tpd) than the proposed General Plan. Therefore, Alternative D's potential solid waste impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

The lower amount of residential development under Alternative D would use less electricity and natural gas than the proposed General Plan. Therefore, potential electrical and natural gas service impacts for the Alternative D would be less than those associated with the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

Overall, Alternative D's potential impacts to utilities would be lower than those identified for the proposed General Plan and remain *less than significant*.

**SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES COMPARISON**

Table VI-9 summarizes the comparative environmental impacts of each of the alternatives when compared to the proposed General Plan. The table lists the level of significance of the impacts of the proposed General Plan to each environmental topic analyzed in Section IV of the Revised Draft EIR and shows whether the impacts anticipated under each proposed alternative would be less, similar, or greater than the proposed General Plan.

**Table VI-9  
Alternatives Impact Comparison**

Impact Area	Proposed General Plan	Alternative				
		No Project	A Quaker Hill	B Chiquita Road	C Nu Forest Products	D Reduced SOI
Aesthetics	S/U <sup>1</sup>	-	-	-	-	-
Agricultural Resources	LTS	=	=	=	=	-
Air Quality	S/U <sup>2</sup>	-	+	=	+	-
Biological Resources	LTS	-	=	=	=	-
Cultural Resources	LTS	-	=	=	=	-
Geology/Soils	LTS	-	=	=	=	-
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	LTS	-	-	-	-	-
Hydrology & Water Quality	LTS	-	=	=	=	-
Land Use	LTS	+	-	-	-	-
Mineral Resources	LTS	=	=	=	=	=
Noise	S/U <sup>3</sup>	-	-	-	-	-
Population & Housing	LTS	=	=	=	=	-
Public Services	LTS	-	=	=	=	-
Traffic/Circulation	S/U <sup>4</sup>	=	=	=	+	-
Utilities	LTS	-	=	=	=	-

*Notes:*

<sup>1</sup> Impacts related to light and glare at Saggio Hills community park

<sup>2</sup> Impacts related to cumulative GHG emissions

<sup>3</sup> Impacts related to substantial cumulative permanent increase in traffic-related noise

<sup>4</sup> Impacts related to Dry Creek Road/U.S. 101 interchange and cumulative traffic on U.S. 101 segments.

S/U = Significant-and-Unavoidable Impact

LTS = Less-than-Significant Impact

+ = Impact greater than the proposed General Plan

= = Impact similar to the proposed General Plan

- = Impact less than the proposed General Plan

It should be noted that where an alternative is identified as having less of an impact in an area where the proposed General Plan would have a significant and unavoidable impact, the degree of reduction is insufficient to lower the impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, all impacts identified as being significant and unavoidable (i.e., aesthetics, air quality, noise, and traffic) would remain at the level under each alternative.

## ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of a project and alternatives, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be selected and the reasons for such a selection disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least amount of significant impacts or which would reduce environmental impacts associated with a proposed project. The proposed General Plan under consideration cannot be identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative is an informational procedure and the Environmentally Superior Alternative may not be the alternative that best meets the goals or needs of the city.

Alternative D (Reduced SOI) is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, as it would have incrementally smaller environmental impacts on aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, population and housing, public services, and utilities.

However, Alternative D could jeopardize the following goals and policies of the City of Healdsburg, as contained in the current Healdsburg General Plan, as explained below:

- *Preserve and enhance Healdsburg’s small-town character and the experience of its natural setting.* (Scenic Resources and Urban Design Goal A.)

*Development shall be allowed only in a manner that protects...the foothills to the...east.* (Scenic Resources and Urban Design Policy A-3)

*Major scenic ridgelines and highly visible hillsides shall be protected from visually obtrusive development. To this end, a visibility analysis shall be required for...projects...located within 200 feet of...the center line of major scenic ridgelines as shown on Figure II-7.* (Scenic Resources and Urban Design Policy A-4)

*The viewshed along scenic highways, roads, and streets shall be protected and enhanced. The following road segments are declared scenic roads:...Highway 101.* (Scenic Resources and Urban Design Policy A-6)

Sub-Area B contains a northwest-southeast trending ridge that is designated on General Plan Figure II-7 as a major scenic ridgeline and which is highly visible from many locations in the city and from U.S. Highway 101. The wooded hillside west of the ridge faces the city of Healdsburg and provides an

attractive backdrop to the community. It is critical that the City maintain control over the ridge and hillside in order to protect these important visual resources.

- *Provide a network of pedestrian/hiking trails...connecting the area's major open space areas and destination points.* (Cultural and Recreational Resources Goal C)

*The City shall develop a pedestrian/hiking system to link the City's parks and major open space areas.* (Cultural and Recreational Resources Policy C-1)

The Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District is seeking to partner with the City of Healdsburg to develop and maintain a trail network through Sub-Area B. This partnership may not be feasible if this area is not ultimately included within the city limits.

As noted above, none of the alternatives, including the Environmentally Superior Alternative would reduce the proposed General Plan's identified *significant and unavoidable* impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, noise, and traffic to a *less than significant* level.