

5 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

As noted in Chapter 3 Alternatives Description, CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project” and evaluate the alternatives against the proposed project.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(e)(2) provides that the analysis for the No Project Alternative should “discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published . . . , as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.” A description of the proposed Project and the Project objectives are provided in Chapter 2. A description of the alternatives, including the original project as described in the Notice of Preparation (original project) and the alternatives considered but rejected, is provided in Chapter 3. This Chapter provides an analysis of the alternatives and a summary of the impacts of the alternatives in Table 5-1.

As noted in Chapter 3 Alternatives Description, the Project has been substantially revised from the project that was described in the Notice of Preparation. The purpose of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 is to “avoid or substantially lessen” effects of a project. Because the Project has been revised to substantially lessen the effects of the project, a discussion of the potential impacts that could have occurred had the original project, as described in the Notice of Preparation, been carried forward in this EIR, also is included in this chapter.

ORIGINAL PROJECT AS DESCRIBED IN NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To avoid and substantially lessen significant impacts, the Applicant changed the original project substantially since issuance of the Notice of Preparation (NOP). Because these changes were made as the project analysis was performed, information is available on the impacts avoided. The following discussion includes the three primary changes in the Project: removal of the area identified as Area of No New Ground Disturbance (as shown in Figure 2-3) from the area of impact, elimination of the overburden site across Lake Herman Road, and elimination of the increase in saleable aggregate and aggregate project.

Area of No New Ground Disturbance: Removal of this 82-acre portion of the original project from further disturbance greatly reduced impacts to oak woodland, native grassland, and callippe silverspot butterfly core and non-core habitat. To a lesser extent, impacts to freshwater marsh, seasonal wetland, waters, and arroyo willow riparian also were avoided. Refer to Figures 4.4-2 and 4.4-5 in Section 4.4 Biological Resources, to see the extent of impacts that were avoided.

Overburden Area Southeast of Lake Herman Road: Use of this area would have resulted in impacts to the following resources: aesthetic resources (use of the overburden area would have required mitigation screening along Lake Herman Road), air quality (haul routes to dispose of overburden would have increased thus increasing emissions), biological resources (use of the overburden area would have caused loss of native grassland, seasonal wetlands, and riparian habitat), cultural resources (use of the overburden area would have disturbed four identified archaeological sites), and hydrology (use of the overburden area would have required mitigation for the construction of new stormwater retention basins). These impacts would be avoided by the Project as proposed.

Increase in Saleable Aggregate: Increasing the tonnage sold would have resulted in impacts to the following resources: air quality (increased use of haul trucks, mobile equipment, and processing equipment would have required mitigation for air pollutants and potentially health risk), greenhouse gases (increased emissions from increased use of haul trucks and mobile equipment would have required mitigation), and transportation (increased truck trips on local roads would have required mitigation to meet

level of service standards on local roadways). These impacts would be avoided by the Project as currently proposed.

ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Through 2014 the conditions of the property would remain approximately the same as the existing conditions, with no impacts. The environmental impacts related to implementation of the 2001 Mining and Reclamation Plan were identified in the October 31, 2001 Mitigated Negative Declaration. After operation of the Quarry ceased, and after reclamation was complete, impacts such as noise, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions would decrease at the Project site. As no further mining activities or improvements would occur after reclamation, no significant impacts would result at the Project site from the No Project Alternative. However, the demand for aggregate would remain the same. Without the Quarry, local construction projects would need to find an alternative source of aggregate product. The Quarry primarily serves or delivers aggregate to five cities: American Canyon, Benicia, Cordelia, Fairfield and Vallejo. These five service areas are between 5 and 16 miles from the Quarry. Depending on the location of a particular construction project and its aggregate product need, the next closest source of supply could be a quarry in Napa County, 14 miles to the north, or a quarry in Contra Costa County, 22 miles to the southeast. However, the permitted capacity of these two quarries combined could not accommodate the demand currently supplied by the Lake Herman Quarry (California Geological Survey, Map 52 Aggregate Availability in California). The next quarries would be in Sonoma County, Yolo County, or Alameda County between 45 and 60 miles away. The No Project Alternative would thus increase vehicle miles traveled, which would result in more air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, and shift traffic impacts to other areas.

Alternative 2: Reduced Biological Impacts

Alternative 2 would be the same as the Project described in Chapter 2 Project Description, except that biological resources along the southern border of the Project site would be avoided with the designation of a 300-foot exclusion buffer along the southern boundary of the Project site. The following discussion on impacts focuses on the difference between the impacts of implementing the Project and the impacts of implementing Alternative 2. Refer to Table 5-1 at the end of this section for a complete comparison of the Project's impacts to the Alternative's impacts.

Aesthetics: Views of the finished cut slopes and the quarry pit expansion area, as identified on Figure 2-3 Proposed Project, would be the same under Alternative 2 as it would be under the Project. Therefore, the visual analysis and conclusions for Alternative 2 would not differ from those identified in Section 4.1 Aesthetics for the Project.

Agricultural and Forest Resources: No loss of agricultural or forest resources would occur with either Alternative 2 or the Project. Therefore, the impact analysis and conclusions for Alternative 2 would not differ from those identified in Section 4.2 Agricultural and Forest Resources for the Project.

Air Quality: Construction and operation activities would be the same for Alternative 2 as the Project. Air emissions from Alternative 2 would be the same as described in Section 4.3 Air Quality. Mitigation Measure AQ-2a, Basic Mitigation Measures for Construction, and Mitigation Measure AQ-2b, Fugitive Dust Mitigation Measure for Operation, would be applicable to Alternative 2.

Biological Resources: Under Alternative 2 there would be a 300-foot exclusion buffer along the southern border of the Project boundary. This exclusion buffer would avoid impacts to 2.5 acres of native grasslands, 0.77 acre of freshwater marsh, 0.35 acre of seasonal wetland, 0.21 acre of arroyo willow riparian vegetation, and 0.01 acre of waters. The impacts to biological resources from Alternative 2 would be reduced, compared to those described for the Project in Section 4.4 Biological Resources. Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, BIO-1b, BIO-1c, BIO-2a, BIO-2b, BIO-2c, BIO-2d, and BIO-3 would still be applicable.

Cultural Resources: Under Alternative 2, the project boundary and area of ground disturbance would be the same as described for the Project. Therefore, the analysis conclusions and mitigation measures described in Section 4.5 Cultural Resources for the Project would be the same for Alternative 2, including implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1a and CR-1b.

Geology: The method of extraction, reclamation, and the project boundary would be the same for both Alternative 2 and the Project. Therefore, the analysis conclusions and mitigation measures described in Section 4.6 Geology and Soils for the Project would be the same for Alternative 2. Mitigation Measures GEO-2a and GEO-2b would still be applicable.

Greenhouse Gas and Energy Use: Energy use and greenhouse gas emissions would be the same for Alternative 2 as they would be for the Project. Therefore, the analysis conclusions described in Section 4.7 Greenhouse Gases for the Project would be the same for Alternative 2. The analysis conclusions and mitigation measures described in Section 4.7 related to conflicts with an applicable plan would be the same for Alternative 2 as the Project, including implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO2-b Oak Woodlands, BIO-2c Native Grasslands, and BIO-2d Non-Native Grasslands.

Hazards & Hazardous Materials: Under Alternative 2 operation of the quarry would be the same as the Project, including the blasting operations, handling and transport of hazardous materials, and worker safety. Therefore, the analysis conclusions and mitigation described in Section 4.8 for the Project would be the same for Alternative 2. This would include implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 Naturally Occurring Asbestos.

Hydrology: The project boundary, depth of extraction, and mining activities would be the same for Alternative 2 as described for the Project. Therefore, the analysis conclusions and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.9 would be the same for Alternative 2, including Mitigation Measures HWQ-1 and HWQ-5.

Land Use: The land use and project boundary would be the same for Alternative 2 as described for the Project, therefore the analysis conclusions in Section 4.10 Land Use would be the same for Alternative 2.

Mineral Resources: The mineral extraction operations would be managed in the same manner under Alternative 2 as they would be for the Project; therefore the analysis conclusion would be the same as described in Section 4.11 Mineral Resources.

Noise: The volume and manner of extraction and processing would be the same under Alternative 2 as they would be under the Project; therefore the analysis conclusion would be the same as described in Section 4.12 Noise.

Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation: Under Alternative 2 operation of the quarry and the project boundary would be the same as for the Project. Therefore the conclusions with regard to landfill capacity and potential conflicts with recreation plans would be the same for Alternative 2 as described for the Project in Section 4.13.

Transportation: The volume of aggregate sales and number of employees would be the same under Alternative 2 as for the Project. Therefore the analysis conclusions would be the same for Alternative 2 as described for the Project in Section 4.14. The bridge improvements and roadway improvements would be the same under Alternative 2 as described for the Project. Therefore, Mitigation Measure TR-4, Traffic Control Procedures, would apply to Alternative 2.

**TABLE 5-1
Impact Summary of the Proposed Project, Alternatives, and Original Project**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 2 – Reduced Biological Impacts	Original Project as Described in Notice of Preparation
Aesthetics				
AES-1. Will the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, recreation use areas, and historic buildings within a scenic highway corridor?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant after Mitigation
AES-2. Will the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant after Mitigation
AES-3. Will the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare, adversely affecting day or nighttime views of the area?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
AES-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect to aesthetics be cumulatively considerable, based on evaluation criteria 1 through 3?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Agricultural and Forest Resources				
AF-1. Will the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency, to non-agricultural use?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
AF-2. Will the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
AF-3. Will the Project conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland, or result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 2 – Reduced Biological Impacts	Original Project as Described in Notice of Preparation
AF-4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
AF-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on agricultural or forest resources be cumulatively considerable based on based on evaluation criteria 1 and 4?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
Air Quality				
AQ-1. Will construction or operation of the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
AQ-2. Will construction or operation of the Project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or project air quality violation?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
AQ-3. Will the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants?	Less than Significant	Potentially Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation
AQ-4. Will the Project cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number people?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	No Impact
AQ-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on air quality and toxic air contaminants be cumulatively considerable based on evaluation criteria 1 through 3?	Less than Significant	Potentially Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation
AQ-C2. Will the Project plus cumulative projects cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 2 – Reduced Biological Impacts	Original Project as Described in Notice of Preparation
Biology				
BIO-1. Will the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
BIO-2. Will the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
BIO-3. Will the Project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
BIO-4. Will the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
BIO-5. Will the Project result in the loss of protected trees?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
BIO-6. Will the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
BIO-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on biological resources based on evaluation criteria 1 through 6?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 2 – Reduced Biological Impacts	Original Project as Described in Notice of Preparation
Cultural Resources				
CR-1. Will the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archeological resource?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
CR-2. Will the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
CR-3. Will the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
CR-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on historical and archeological resources be cumulatively considerable, based on criteria 1 and 2?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
CR-C2. Will the Project's incremental effect on paleontological resources be cumulatively considerable?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Geology and Soils				
GEO-1. Will the Project be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
GEO-2. Will the Project expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
GEO-3. Will the Project expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from landslides?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
GEO-4. Will the Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 2 – Reduced Biological Impacts	Original Project as Described in Notice of Preparation
GEO-5. Will the Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1 of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risk to life or property?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
GEO-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on geology or soils be cumulatively considerable, based on criteria 1 through 5?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
Greenhouse Gas and Energy Use				
GG-1. Will the Project generate GhG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
GG-2. Will the Project conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GhGs?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
GG-1C. Will the Project plus cumulative projects generate GhG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less than Significant	Potentially Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation
GG-2C. Will the Project plus cumulative projects conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GhGs?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
Hazardous Materials				
HAZ-1. Will the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
HAZ-2. Will the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant after Mitigation

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 2 – Reduced Biological Impacts	Original Project as Described in Notice of Preparation
HAZ-3. Will the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65692.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
HAZ-4. Will the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
HAZ-5. Will the Project expose the workers to safety hazards associated with operation of heavy machinery, vehicles, or equipment; creation of accessible excavations; or handling of hazardous materials?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
HAZ-6. Will the Project increase the potential exposure of the public to disease vectors (i.e., mosquitoes)?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
HAZ-C1. Will the Project plus cumulative projects create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
HAZ-C2. Will the Project plus cumulative projects create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
HAZ-C3. Will the Project plus cumulative projects be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65692.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 2 – Reduced Biological Impacts	Original Project as Described in Notice of Preparation
HAZ-C4. Will the Project plus cumulative projects expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
HAZ-C5. Will the Project plus cumulative projects expose the workers to safety hazards associated with operation of heavy machinery, vehicles, or equipment; creation of accessible excavations (trenches, pits, or borings); or handling of hazardous materials?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
HAZ-C6. Will the Project plus cumulative projects increase the potential exposure of the public to disease vectors (i.e., mosquitoes)?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Hydrology and Groundwater				
HWQ-1. Will the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant after Mitigation
HWQ-2. Will the Project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
HWQ-3. Will the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant after Mitigation

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 2 – Reduced Biological Impacts	Original Project as Described in Notice of Preparation
HWQ-4. Will the Project create or contribute runoff water which would provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
HWQ-5. Will the Project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows, or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
HWQ-6. Will the Project substantially decrease surface-water contributions to Sulphur Springs Creek and Blue Rock Creek?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
HWQ-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on hydrology and groundwater be cumulatively considerable, based on evaluation criteria 1 through 6?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Land Use and Housing				
LU-1. Will the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environment effect or increase potential for conflict as a result of incompatible land uses?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
LU-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on land use and planning policies be cumulatively considerable?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 2 – Reduced Biological Impacts	Original Project as Described in Notice of Preparation
Mineral Resources				
MR-1. Will the Project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
MR-2. Will mineral extraction operations be managed and recovered in accordance with applicable requirements?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
MR-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on mineral resources be cumulatively considerable based on evaluation criteria 1 and 2?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
Noise				
NO-1. Will Project operations generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
NO-2. Will Project construction activities result in generation of excessive ground-borne vibration levels?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
NO-3. Will Project operation cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing in the vicinity?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
NO-4. Will the Project result in a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
NO-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect to noise be cumulatively considerable, based on evaluation criteria 1 through 3?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 2 – Reduced Biological Impacts	Original Project as Described in Notice of Preparation
Public Services and Utilities				
PS-1. Would the Project be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
PS-2. Would the Project increase demand for electrical or gas facilities to such a degree that accepted service standards are not maintained?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
PS-3. Would the Project conflict with any applicable recreational plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, Tri-City and County Cooperative Plan, pedestrian plan, or bicycle plan)?	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
PS-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on public services, utilities, or recreation be cumulatively considerable, based on evaluation criteria 1 through 3?	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Transportation				
TR-1. Will the Project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	Less than Significant	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
TR-2. Will the Project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Less than Significant	Potentially Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 2 – Reduced Biological Impacts	Original Project as Described in Notice of Preparation
TR-3. Will the Project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No Impact	Potentially Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation
TR-4. Will the Project result in inadequate emergency access?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Less than Significant after Mitigation
TR-5. Will the Project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	Less than Significant after Mitigation	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant after Mitigation
TR-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on traffic be cumulatively considerable, based on criteria TR-1 and TR-2?	No Impact	Potentially Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant after Mitigation
TR-C2. Will the Project's incremental effect on traffic be cumulatively considerable, based on criteria TR-3 through TR-4?	Less than Significant	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant