



## CITY OF SAUSALITO

### PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY / NEGATIVE DECLARATION

#### **BACKGROUND**

Project Name/No.: City of Sausalito Historic Design Guidelines/  
CDD/ENV/ZOA 09-074

Project Location: City Wide

General Plan Designation: All

Zoning District: All

City Approvals Required: Zoning Ordinance Amendment

Outside Agency  
Approvals Required: None

Lead Agency: City of Sausalito City Council  
c/o Sausalito Community Development Department  
420 Litho Street  
Sausalito, CA 94965

Contact Person: Heidi Burns, Associate Planner  
(415) 289-4135

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The City of Sausalito has recently prepared and released a Public Review Draft of the Historic Design Guidelines (which is termed the "Project" or "Guidelines" for the purposes of this study). The Sausalito Community Development Department Staff and the Sausalito Historic Landmarks Board have worked together with a consulting firm (Winter and Company) to guide the development of the Project. A public hearing was conducted on May 11, 2011 by the Historic Landmarks Board to solicit public input. The Planning Commission and City Council will conduct public hearings in June 2011 and July 2011 to solicit input as well. The Public Draft of the Historic Design Guidelines can be viewed and downloaded from the City of Sausalito website at <http://www.ci.sausalito.ca.us/Index.aspx?page=695>.

This Initial Environmental Study/Negative Declaration (IES/ND) addresses potential impacts of adopting and applying the Guidelines at a general level. Specific project-level impacts involving application of the Guidelines will be evaluated at the time individual discretionary projects require a Design Review Permit pursuant to Chapter 10.54 of the Sausalito Zoning Ordinance. As a result, this document serves as a Negative Declaration pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21065 and 21080(c), and Article 6 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15071, the Negative Declaration described the proposed project, identifies, analyses, and evaluates the potential significant environmental impacts that may result from the proposed project. Furthermore, there are no significant environmental effects that are not peculiar to the project and were not analyzed as significant effects, including off-site impacts and cumulative impacts, in the General Plan EIR or for which new information is known that identifies a more severe impact.

### **DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- X** The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and this study constitutes a NEGATIVE DECLARATION in accordance with Section 15071 of the CEQA Guidelines.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WOULD NOT be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION would be prepared.
- The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- The proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Initial Environmental Study/  
Negative Declaration Prepared By: Heidi Burns, Associate Planner

Date Prepared: June 1, 2011

Approved By: Heidi Burns 6.1.11  
Heidi Burns Date

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposed project consists of the approval of Historic Design Guidelines (referred herein as the “Guidelines”) and a Zoning Ordinance Amendment to require Design Review Permits to be consistent with the Guidelines.

The purpose of the Guidelines is to explain, interpret and expand upon general design criteria currently found in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Unlike the Zoning Ordinance, the Guidelines establish preferences and recommendations, rather than development standards and regulations. The Guidelines therefore provide greater flexibility than zoning regulations in advancing the goal of protecting the City’s historic resources. The Guidelines would be applied to properties located within designated Historic Overlay Districts; properties listed on the Local, State, and/or National Register; and Arks.

The overall objectives of the Guidelines are as follows:

- ✓ Provide guidance to design professionals and property owners for the treatment of historic resources and historic characteristics unique to Sausalito.
- ✓ Provide the basis for decisions by which the Historic Landmarks Board, the Planning Commission, the City Council, and staff can evaluate projects as it relates to the preferred treatment of historic properties.
- ✓ Provide a concise framework for proposed design and construction for properties within the Downtown Historic Overlay Zoning District, future overlay zoning districts, and historic properties, including those properties listed on the Local, State, and/or National Register, and arks.
- ✓ Protect and reinforce the visual continuity of the community.
- ✓ Protect and enhance property values through historic preservation.
- ✓ Protect important structures that are considered historic resources and “Contributing” to the designed Historic Districts and to the neighborhood character and context.
- ✓ Protect the designated Historic Overlay Zoning District(s) by assuring new construction and additions to buildings are compatible with the Historic Overlay Zoning District(s).

The proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment may include, but not be limited to, a modification of Design Review Permit Finding 10.54.050.D.1 to add a reference to the Historic Design Guidelines.

**GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

Sausalito is located in Marin County, which is one of nine counties that comprise the Bay Area Region. Sausalito is located in the southern part of Marin County, bounded on the northwest by Marin City; on the northeast by Richardson’s Bay and San Francisco Bay; and on the southwest by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Sausalito encompasses both steep, wooded hillside and shoreline tidal flats. According to the United States Census Bureau, the city has a total area of 2.2 square miles, of which 1.9 square miles of it is land and the remaining 0.3 square miles is under water. The population of Sausalito in 2010 is 7,061 according to the 2010 census.

Sausalito has a mixture of commercial, industrial (general and marine related), and residential uses with residential being the predominant use. With this mixture of uses couples with its land constraints, the City has limited areas available for infill construction.

An important defining characteristic of Sausalito is the age of its buildings. As described in the Community Development and Historical Preservation Element of the General Plan, “about half of the City’s buildings were constructed before 1950, some as early as the late 1800’s.” Since the late 1970’s the City has designated a Downtown Historic Overlay Zoning District comprised of 76 properties, three properties have been listed in the National Register of Historic Places, and one property has been procedurally listed on the Local Register.

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>1. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				✓
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?				✓
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				✓
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				

**Discussion** – The purposes of the Historic Design Guidelines are to explain, interpret and expand upon general design criteria related to existing historic properties currently found in the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan, in addition to providing guidance to property owners, decision-makers, staff, and the public for the preservation of the architectural heritage and integrity of the City’s historic resources. Unlike the Zoning Ordinance, the Guidelines establish preferences and recommendations rather than rigid standards. The Guidelines therefore may be applied with greater flexibility than zoning regulations in advancing the goal of protecting the City’s historic resources.

The Guidelines would facilitate the preservation of the architectural heritage and integrity of the City’s historic resources by identifying standards to ensure that changes to the built environment would be sensitive to the community’s historical legacy. As the intent of the Guidelines is to aid in

the treatment of historic properties consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, no impact to aesthetics is anticipated with the approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines.

Additionally, the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment (ZOA) is to ensure the appropriate review authority considers the Guidelines when reviewing Design Review Permit projects for properties which are subject to the Guidelines.

**Mitigation Measures - No Mitigation Measures Required**

<b>2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				✓
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				✓
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				✓

**Discussion** – The City of Sausalito does not have any land that is used or zoned for agricultural or farmland purposes, therefore the approval of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would not create any impacts on agricultural resources.

**Mitigation Measures - No Mitigation Measures Required**

<b>3. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan?				✓
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				✓
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of				

any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				✓
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				✓
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				✓

**Discussion** – The San Francisco Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for measuring the air quality of the region. The BAAQMD is a regional agency that regulates sources of air pollution within the nine San Francisco Bay Area counties.

The Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance amendment would not impact any issues related to air quality because the Project would not exacerbate levels of development identified beyond those analyzed in the General Plan. Additionally, the Guidelines do not provide any specific policy statements regarding air quality. Lastly and as previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purpose of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are being evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures - No Mitigation Measures Required**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				✓
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				✓
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				✓
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				✓
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation				✓

policy or ordinance?				
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				✓

**Discussion** – Approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would not impact biological resources as the Guidelines will apply to the portions of developed properties which do not contain significant biological resources. Therefore, as previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purpose of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures** - No Mitigation Measures Required

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?				✓
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?				✓
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				✓
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				✓

**Discussion** – As previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purposes of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated. Furthermore, the intent of the Guidelines is to aid in the treatment of historic properties consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, and as a result, no negative impact is anticipated with the approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines.

**Mitigation Measures** - No Mitigation Measures Required

6. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				✓

b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.				✓
---	--	--	--	---

**Discussion** – The City has not adopted any plan, policy, or regulation for the purposes of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally, the approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would not exacerbate impacts related to greenhouse emissions beyond the maximum build-out envisioned by the General Plan. The Guidelines may in fact reduce potential greenhouse gas emission through guidelines related to adaptive reuse and rehabilitation of existing buildings instead of the demolition and new construction, in addition to guidelines related to energy efficiency, such as allowances for solar panels. Therefore, as previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purpose of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures** - No Mitigation Measures Required

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?				✓
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?				✓
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				✓
iv. Landslides?				✓
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				✓
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				✓
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				✓
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				✓

**Discussion** – Approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would not impact any issue related to geology and soils. As previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purposes of the Guidelines and the Zoning

Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures - No Mitigation Measures Required**

<b>8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				✓
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				✓
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				✓
d. Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				✓
e. For a project located within any Airport Land Use Plan, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✓
g. 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?				✓

**Discussion** – Approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would not create any significant impacts to hazards and hazardous materials beyond those impacts identified in the General Plan. As previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purposes of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures - No Mitigation Measures Required**

<b>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				✓
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere				

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

**Discussion** – Approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would neither impact existing public and/or private drainage improvements, nor create the need for new drainage facilities. Furthermore, the Guidelines would not impact any issues related to water quality and waste discharge. As previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purposes of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures** - No Mitigation Measures Required

<b>10. LAND USE, PLANNING, POPULATION, AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i></b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a. Conflict with the Sausalito General Plan, Downtown Specific Plan and/or Development Code or 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 environmental effect?				✓

b. Physically divide an established community?				✓
c. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				✓
d. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
e. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

**Discussion** – An important defining characteristic of Sausalito is the age range of its buildings. The General Plan policies aid in the preservation of the City’s rich and colorful history. Many of the policies relating to the Community Design and Historical Preservation Element of the General Plan have been implanted and incorporated into the City’s Municipal Code. The Historic Design Guidelines will implement General Plan Program CD-7.2.7, HLB Guidelines. Program CD-7.2.7 recommends general guidelines be prepared for the preservation, restoration, and rehabilitation of Sausalito’s historic properties, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would be consistent with the purpose and intent of the Community Design and Historical Preservation Element of the General Plan. Additionally, it is not anticipated the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would create any negative impacts to land use, planning, population, and housing above and beyond those impacts envisioned by the General Plan. Furthermore, as previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purposes of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures** – No mitigation is required.

<b>11. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?				✓
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				✓

**Discussion** – The City of Sausalito does not have any known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State, therefore the approval of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would not create a potentially significant impact on any mineral resources.

If mineral resources were to be identified in any update to the General Plan or any other land use plan, the approval of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance amendment would

not impact this resource because the Project would not exacerbate levels of development identified beyond the General Plan. Furthermore, as previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purposes of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures** - No mitigation is required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>12. NOISE.</b> <i>Would the project result in:</i>				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the Sausalito General Plan or Development Code, or applicable standards of other agencies?				✓
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				✓
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				✓
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				✓
e. For a project located within the Sausalito-Tahoe Airport Land Use Plan, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓

**Discussion** – Approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would not create any noise impacts related to short term construction and long term land uses above and beyond those impacts envisioned by the General Plan. As previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purposes of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures** – No mitigation is required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>13. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b>				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?				✓
ii. Police protection?				✓

iii. Schools?				✓
iv. Other public facilities?				✓

**Discussion** – Approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would not create the need for new or expanded public services facility improvements relating to fire and police protection, schools, and/or other public facilities. As previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purposes of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures** - No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14. RECREATION.</b>				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				✓
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				✓

**Discussion** – Approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would not create the need for new or expanded recreation and/or park improvements. As previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purposes of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures** - No mitigation is required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>15. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				✓
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the Sausalito General Plan, Development Code, and/or Public Improvement and Engineering Standards?				✓
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				✓
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or				✓

incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				✓
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				✓
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				✓

**Discussion** – Approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would not create the need for new or expanded transportation and/or traffic improvements. As previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purposes of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures** - No Mitigation Measures Required

<b>16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region?				✓
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				✓
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?				✓
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?				✓
g. Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				✓

**Discussion** – Approval and implementation of the Historic Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would not create the need for new or expanded utility and service systems. As previously discussed in the *Aesthetics* section of the IES/ND, the purposes of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to ensure design preferences related to the treatment of historic resources are considered when Design Review Permits are evaluated.

**Mitigation Measures** - No Mitigation Measure Required.

<b>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				✓
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				✓
c. Does the project have environmental effects, which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				✓

The determinations of the mandatory findings of significance are supported by the discussion contained within individual resource sections above. This study identifies no adverse impacts on the environment, therefore no mitigation measures are necessary to reduce any potential impacts related to the project.