

Executive Summary

This draft environmental impact report (draft EIR) has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed *Climate Action 2020: Community Climate Action Plan* (CAP). As required by Section 15123 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this executive summary contains the following.

- Project Overview
- Project Objectives
- Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures
- Project Alternatives
- Potential Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

Project Overview

In 2009, the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority (RCPA) was formed to coordinate countywide climate change protection efforts among Sonoma County's (County's) multiple agencies and nine incorporated jurisdictions to establish a clearinghouse for greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction efforts throughout the County. The RCPA is composed of 10 jurisdictions—Sonoma County, the Town of Windsor, and the following incorporated cities: Cloverdale, Cotati, Healdsburg, Petaluma, Rohnert Park, Santa Rosa, Sebastopol, and the City of Sonoma.

The RCPA and participating jurisdictions are proposing to adopt the CAP in order to implement measures to reduce GHGs and adapt to climate change within the eight incorporated jurisdictions¹ and the unincorporated areas within Sonoma County. As part of the CAP, the RCPA is estimating GHG emissions for 1990 and 2010 and forecasting future emissions for 2020 and beyond. The community inventory includes GHG emissions occurring in association with the land uses within a jurisdictional boundary, and it consists of sources of emissions that a community can more readily influence or control. Emissions sectors analyzed in the CAP include: building energy, land use and transportation, off-road transportation and equipment, solid waste generation, wastewater treatment, water conveyance, and agriculture.

The draft CAP will be released before or during the public review period for this draft EIR. The draft CAP may be revised in response to public input throughout the public review process prior to consideration for adoption by the RCPA and by the participating jurisdictions.

¹ The City of Santa Rosa (Santa Rosa) has completed a separate CAP (*Santa Rosa Climate Action Plan*, adopted June 5, 2012). This draft EIR will not analyze the impacts of the GHG-reduction measures developed by Santa Rosa under the *Santa Rosa Climate Action Plan*. Santa Rosa adopted an EIR for their 2012 CAP prior to CAP approval.

Project Objectives

The proposed CAP would include both regional measures (to be implemented by the RCPA and other regional agencies with local government support) and local measures (to be implemented by local governments with RCPA and regional agency support and on their own) to reduce GHG emissions. The proposed objectives of the CAP are to:

- Identify specific actions that the RCPA, other regional agencies, each participating jurisdiction, and individual residents and businesses can implement to reduce GHG emissions consistent with and even exceeding the goals established in Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32); **specifically, the CAP target is to reduce countywide GHG emissions by 25% below 1990 levels by 2020.**
- Promote consistency with the land use policy direction and growth anticipated in local general plans.
- Allow for continued economic growth to provide opportunities for businesses and residents.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Summary of Project Impacts

The project impacts are summarized in Table ES-1 (presented at the end of this summary). For potentially significant impacts, mitigation measures are identified, where feasible, to reduce the impact on environmental resources to a less-than-significant level. Refer to Chapter 3, *Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures*, for a detailed discussion of project impacts and detailed descriptions of the mitigation measures.

Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

Impacts related to the following topic would remain significant with the implementation of mitigation.

- Cultural Resources: Implementation of CAP-promoted rooftop solar facilities could substantially change the character-defining features of historic buildings.

Project Alternatives

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 require the EIR to evaluate the No Project Alternative and a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that would feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives but that would avoid or substantially reduce any identified significant environmental impacts of the project. The project alternatives present options that could reduce a significant impact to a less-than-significant level.

The following alternatives to the project were analyzed in Chapter 5, *Alternatives Analysis*.

- **Alternative 1: No Project.** The County will not adopt and implement a countywide CAP. The statewide measures for reducing GHG emissions related to building energy and transportation and already-adopted plans and programs related to reducing GHG emissions would remain in

effect as part of the No Project Alternative. This alternative would result in 2020 GHG emissions approximately 20 percent below 1990 levels instead of 25 percent below 1990 levels.

- **Alternative 2: Zero Net Energy Buildings Alternative.** The County would adopt an updated green building ordinance, requiring zero net energy (ZNE) for all new commercial and residential buildings in the County beginning in 2017. With increased GHG emission reductions from ZNE, CAP measures incentivizing rooftop photovoltaic solar panels on existing residential and non-residential buildings would be modified to not include installation on historic buildings. While it is technically feasible to construct ZNE buildings using current technology, the cost of constructing such buildings will be substantially higher than current new buildings; therefore, it is uncertain whether it would be financially feasible. This alternative would result in the same GHG emissions as the proposed project.
- **Alternative 3: Carbon Offset Alternative.** The County would reduce GHG emissions through the purchase of valid carbon offsets. With increased reliance on carbon offsets, CAP measures incentivizing rooftop photovoltaic solar panels on existing residential and non-residential buildings would be modified to not include installation on historic buildings. This alternative would result in the same GHG emissions as the proposed project.

Table ES-2 (presented at the end of this summary, after Table ES-1) provides a comparison of the potential impacts among alternatives to the project by resource topic. When considering the full range of potential environmental impacts, the Zero Net Energy Buildings Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative because it would have lower impacts on historical resources compared with the project and greater benefits related to energy, compared with the other alternatives. Further, the co-benefits of GHG emissions reduction would be realized locally (compared to the Carbon Offset Alternative).

Scoping

On September 24, 2015, the RCPA filed a notice of preparation (NOP) with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research. One organization and one member of the public submitted written comments during the 30-day comment period (which ended October 28, 2015). All written comments received during the comment period session were considered in the preparation of this draft EIR. A copy of the NOP and all comments are provided in Appendix A. Following is a summary of the comments received.

- Edward Kinney provided comments related to the CAP and GHG reduction efforts in the County. The comments advised the CAP should address the following issues: traffic management plans in the County, job-housing imbalance in the County, emissions from the wine fermentation industry, and drought impacts on air quality.
- Sonoma County Conservation Action provided comments suggesting modifications to the CAP measures. These include the following: increasing the use of solar power, streamlining the permitting process for electric vehicle measures, addressing the County's green waste/compost issue, and increasing residential density and infill.

Potential Areas of Controversy and Issues to Be Resolved

The scoping comments described above express interest in the CAP covering certain topics, but they do not specifically identify areas of controversy related to the environmental effects of the CAP.

Based on public and stakeholder outreach conducted during preparation of the CAP, the RCPA has identified the following areas of controversy:

- *CAP Targets:* Some members of the public desire that the CAP include a more aggressive GHG reduction target that would put the County on an even lower emissions trajectory than proposed in the CAP. Some members of the public desire that the County only adopt a target that matches, but does not exceed the AB 32 target for 2020. The CAP explains the rationale for the proposed reduction target for 2020 and the long-term targets for 2030 and 2050.
- *Lifecycle GHG Emissions:* Some members of the public desire that the CAP address so-called “lifecycle” GHG emissions related to activities within Sonoma County. These emissions include the upstream GHG emissions elsewhere associated with the consumption of goods, products, and services in Sonoma County as well as the downstream GHG emissions associated with goods, products, and services produced in Sonoma County but consumed elsewhere. The CAP explains that the current climate action planning practice for cities and counties, states, and nations is to focus on the production-side GHG emissions most directly within the control of a jurisdiction.
- *Including or Excluding Specific GHG Reduction Measures in the CAP:* Some members of the public desire certain GHG reduction measures to be included or excluded from the CAP. For example, members of the building industry expressed concern that measures requiring mandatory retrofits for existing development not be included in the CAP.
- *Resolving Ongoing Land Use Issues through the CAP:* Some members of the public desire that the CAP address ongoing land use issues through the CAP, such as resolving issues surrounding green waste/composting, jobs-housing balances, limitation on new wineries or vineyard expansion, or issues concerning community separators. As explained in the CAP and the EIR, one of the key objectives of the CAP is that it be consistent with and supportive of current land use plans and policies.

The following issues are yet to be resolved:

- *Selection of Local CAP Measures:* Each local jurisdiction must ultimately determine the measures that it will implement. Each local jurisdiction has selected the measures included for its community within the draft CAP.
- *Specific Implementing Details of Local CAP Measures:* Certain CAP measures include some flexibility in implementation that will require choices by individual jurisdictions as they implement the individual reduction measures they select.

Table ES-1. Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Aesthetics			
Impact AES-1: Implementation of the CAP could result in substantial adverse effects on scenic views or vistas, substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, or substantially degrade the existing visual character of the County	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact AES-2: Implementation of the CAP could result in an increase of daytime glare and/or nighttime lighting	Significant	Mitigation Measure AES-1: Design guidelines for photovoltaic solar energy panels on rooftops regarding glare and safety	Less than significant
Impact C-AES-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on aesthetics	Significant	Mitigation Measure AES-1	Less than considerable contribution
Agricultural and Forest Resources			
Impact AG-1: Implementation of the CAP could convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact AG-2: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact AG-3: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with zoning for or cause rezoning of forestland or timberland or result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact AG-4: Implementation of the CAP could involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forestland to non-forest use	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact C-AG-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on agricultural and forest resources	Less than considerable contribution	None required	--
Air Quality			
Impact AQ-1: Implementation of the CAP would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan	Beneficial	None required	--

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact AQ-2a: Implementation of the CAP could violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing long-standing air quality violation during construction activities	Significant	Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Implement basic construction mitigation measures to reduce construction emissions	Less than significant
Impact AQ-2b: Implementation of the CAP could violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing long-standing air quality violation during operation	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact AQ-3: Implementation of the CAP could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact AQ-4: Implementation of the CAP could expose sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact AQ-5: Implementation of the CAP could create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact C-AQ-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on air quality	Significant	Mitigation Measure AQ-1	Less than considerable contribution
Biological Resources			
Impact BIO-1: Implementation of the CAP could impact sensitive and special-status species and their associated habitat or migratory corridors	Significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Project-level biological surveys and avoidance, minimizations, and compensation for impacts on CEQA-defined special-status species, sensitive natural communities, state- and federally protected waters/wetlands, and riparian habitat Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Replacement of removed trees Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Preconstruction surveys	Less than significant
Impact BIO-2: Implementation of the CAP could impact wetland and riparian habitat in some areas of the County	Significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-1a Mitigation Measure BIO-1b Mitigation Measure BIO-1c	Less than significant
Impact BIO-3: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan	Significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-1b	Less than significant

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact C-BIO-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on biological resources	Significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-1a Mitigation Measure BIO-1b Mitigation Measure BIO-1c	Less than considerable contribution
Cultural Resources			
Impact CUL-1: Implementation of the CAP could result in the potential disturbance of historical resources	Significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-1a: Review of alternatives for solar roofs on historic buildings Mitigation Measure CUL-1b: Studies documenting the presence/absence of historical resources Mitigation Measure CUL-1c: Historical resources investigations	Significant and unavoidable for CAP solar roofs on historic buildings; less than significant for all other CAP facilities
Impact CUL-2: Implementation of the CAP could result in the potential disturbance of known or undiscovered archaeological resources and human remains	Significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-2a: Cultural resource investigations and protection and recovery of significant resources Mitigation Measure CUL-2b: Work stoppage if cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities Mitigation Measure CUL-2c: Work stoppage if human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities	Less than significant
Impact CUL-3: Implementation of the CAP could result in the potential disturbance of paleontological resources within the County	Significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Avoidance of encountered paleontological resources until resources have been evaluated and recorded, and treatment has been determined	Less than significant
Impact C-CUL-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on cultural resources	Significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-1a Mitigation Measure CUL-1b Mitigation Measure CUL-1c Mitigation Measure CUL-2a Mitigation Measure CUL-2b Mitigation Measure CUL-2c Mitigation Measure CUL-3	Considerable contribution
Geology and Soils			
Impact GEO-1: Implementation of the CAP could expose people or structures to risks involving earthquake induced seismic hazards, such as surface fault ruptures, groundshaking, ground failures including liquefaction, and landslides	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact GEO-2: Implementation of the CAP could result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil	Less than significant	None required	--

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact GEO-3: Facilities promoted by the CAP could be located on an unstable geological unit/soil or expansive soil, potentially resulting in increased risks of geologic and soil hazards or damage to project structures	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact GEO-4: Implementation of the CAP would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems that would result in soil impacts	No impact	None required	--
Impact C-GEO-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact to geology and soils	Less than considerable contribution	None required	--
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Impact GHG-1: Implementation of the CAP would be consistent with and would support applicable plan, policy, and regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions	Beneficial	None required	--
Impact GHG-2: Implementation of the CAP would help Sonoma County to be more resilient to the future effects of climate change on Sonoma County	Disclosure item only; not a CEQA impact	None required	--
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Impact HAZ-1a: Implementation of the CAP could cause a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment during construction	Significant	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Spill prevention, control, and countermeasure program for construction activities	Less than significant
Impact HAZ-1b: Implementation of the CAP could cause a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment during operation	Less than significant	None required	--

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact HAZ-2: Implementation of the CAP could emit or involve handling hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school	Significant	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1	Less than significant
Impact HAZ-3: Implementation of the CAP could be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact HAZ-4: Implementation of the CAP could be located within an airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact HAZ-5: Implementation of the CAP could interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact HAZ-6: Implementation of the CAP could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact C-HAZ-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact from hazards and hazardous materials	Significant	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1	Less than considerable contribution
Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact HYD-1a: Implementation of the CAP could violate water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, or could otherwise substantially degrade water quality during construction	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact HYD-1b: Implementation of the CAP could violate water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, or could otherwise substantially degrade water quality during operation	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact HYD-2: Implementation of the CAP could substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge in the County	Less than significant	None required	--

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact HYD-3: Implementation of the CAP could alter existing drainage patterns in the County that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact HYD-4: Implementation of the CAP could create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact HYD-5: Implementation of the CAP could place housing within flood hazard areas or could place structures within flood hazard areas that would impede or redirect flood flows	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact HYD-6: Implementation of the CAP could expose people or structures to significant risk involving flooding a result of levee or dam failures	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact HYD-7: Implementation of the CAP could contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact C-HYD-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact to hydrology and water quality	Less than considerable contribution	None required	--
Land Use and Recreation			
Impact LU-1: Implementation of the CAP could physically divide an established community	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact LU-2: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact LU-3: Implementation of the CAP would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan	No impact	None required	--

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact LU-4: Implementation of the CAP could temporarily disrupt recreational facilities during construction but would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact LU-5: Implementation of the CAP would include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that could have an adverse physical effect on the environment	Significant	Mitigation to be identified during project-level review, as appropriate	Less than significant
Impact C-LU-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on land use and recreation	Less than considerable contribution	None required	--
Noise			
Impact NOI-1a: Implementation of the CAP could generate noise levels in excess of local standards or result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels during construction	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact NOI-1b: Implementation of the CAP could generate noise levels in excess of local standards or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels during operation	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact NOI-2: Implementation of the CAP could expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact NOI-3: New development promoted by the CAP could be located within airport land use plan areas, within 2 miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact C-NOI-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact from noise	Less than considerable contribution	None required	--

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Public Services, Utilities, and Energy			
Impact PSU-1: Implementation of the CAP could reduce service ratios or response times for fire protection or police protection services or require new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios and response times	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact PSU-2: Implementation of the CAP could increase student enrollment at schools or increase level of service required at other public facilities resulting in an adverse physical impact to these facilities	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact PSU-3: Implementation of the CAP could decrease the demand for water supply and thus would reduce the demand for additional water supplies but would increase demand for water facilities infrastructure related to water efficiency, renewable energy, recycled water and greywater use	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact PSU-4: Implementation of the CAP could decrease wastewater generation and thus would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements, but would require the expansion or modification of existing wastewater facilities	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact PSU-5: Implementation of the CAP could require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact PSU-6: Implementation of the CAP would reduce solid waste generation and would not conflict with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste diversion	Beneficial	None required	--
Impact PSU-7: Implementation of the CAP would not result in land use locations and patterns causing wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy	Beneficial	None required	--
Impact PSU-8: Implementation of the CAP would not result in the construction of new or retrofitted buildings that would have excessive energy requirements for daily operation	Beneficial	None required	--

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact PSU-9: Implementation of the CAP would not result in increased energy demand and the need for additional energy resources overall	Beneficial	None required	--
Impact C-PSU-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on public services, utilities, and energy	Less than considerable contribution, usually beneficial	None required	--
Transportation and Traffic			
Impact TR-1a: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to the transportation circulation system during construction	Significant	Mitigation Measure TR-1: Traffic control plan implementation during construction activities	Less than significant
Impact TR-1b: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to the transportation circulation system during operation	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact TR-2: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with an applicable congestion management program established by the Sonoma County Transportation Authority for designated roads or highways	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact TR-3: Implementation of the CAP could change air traffic patterns resulting in substantial safety risks	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact TR-4a: Implementation of the CAP could substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses during construction	Significant	Mitigation Measure TR-1	Less than significant
Impact TR-4b: Implementation of the CAP could substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses during operation	Less than significant	None required	--
Impact TR-5a: Implementation of the CAP could result in inadequate emergency access during construction	Significant	Mitigation Measure TR-1	Less than significant
Impact TR-5b: Implementation of the CAP could result in inadequate emergency access during operation	Less than significant	None required	--

Impact	Significance before Mitigation		Significance after Mitigation
	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	
Impact TR-6: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs related to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities or could otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities	Beneficial	None required	--
Impact C-TR-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact to transportation and traffic	Significant	Mitigation Measure TR-1	Less than considerable contribution

Table ES-2. Comparison of Project Alternatives to the Project

	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Zero Net Energy Buildings	Alternative 3: Carbon Offset (Due to CAP measures/Due to offset projects) (1)
Aesthetics	Lower	Same	Same/Unknown
Agriculture and Forest Resources	Similar	Same	Same/Unknown
Air Quality	Greater	Same	Same/Same
Biological Resources	Greater	Similar	Same/Unknown
Cultural Resources	Lower	Lower	Lower/Unknown
Geology and Soils	Lower	Same	Same/Same
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Greater	Same	Same/Same
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Greater	Same	Same/Unknown
Hydrology and Water Quality	Greater	Same	Same/Same
Land Use and Recreation	Lower	Same	Same/Unknown
Noise	Greater	Same	Same/Unknown
Public Services, Utilities, and Energy	Less for public services; Higher for public utilities and energy	Same for public services and utilities; Lower for energy	Same for Energy and Public services Same/Unknown for utilities
Transportation and Traffic	Greater	Same	Same/Same

(1) As discussed in text, the offset alternative would allow elimination of CAP measures with secondary environmental effects. The analysis uses the example of excluding solar installation on historic buildings. The impact comparisons above are presented separately for the CAP measures vs. offset projects. As offset measures are not known at this time, many of the impacts cannot be determined.