

## 4.10 OTHER VALUES

### 4.10.1 ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED PROJECT

#### *NOISE*

Any type of commercial development has the potential to affect the existing ambient noise environment in the immediate project vicinity. The following noise sources are attributable to traffic and site operations:

- Increases in traffic volumes on the local roadway network would result in increases in traffic noise levels along roadways that serve the site.
- Construction activities associated with development would cause short-term increases in the ambient noise environment.
- On-site traffic flow and parking lot activities associated with the development would cause increases in the ambient noise environment.
- Operation of the wastewater treatment facility could cause an increase in the ambient noise environment in the immediate vicinity of that facility.
- Truck deliveries and loading dock activities associated with the ongoing operation of the casino, hotel, retail uses, and restaurants would result in intermittent increases in ambient noise in the immediate vicinity of loading dock areas.
- Mechanical equipment associated with the heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems as well as refrigeration equipment associated with food cold storage could cause an appreciable permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the immediate project vicinity.

An environmental noise analysis report was conducted to assess the noise impacts identified above, associated with the development of the Proposed Project and Alternatives (**Appendix R**).

#### *Construction Noise*

During the construction phase of Alternative A, noise from construction would dominate the noise environment in the immediate area. Equipment used for construction would generate noise levels as indicated in **Table 4.10-1**. A more detailed listing of potential construction equipment noise levels can be found in **Appendix R**. Maximum noise levels from different types of equipment under different operating conditions could range from 70 audible decibels (dBA) to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. The most noticeable project-generated construction noise source would be truck traffic associated with transport of heavy materials and equipment and fixed equipment such as generators. When the activity includes pile driving or pavement breaking, the dominant noise sources are the impacts of the tools themselves.

As described in detail in Appendix R, worst-case average sound levels at nearby sensitive receptors would be 79 dB Ldn. Note, however, that even for the receptors close enough to the site boundary to be exposed to these levels, the noise sources would be located at various places on the site during the various construction phases. In addition, the facilities that would be built nearest the site boundary, and hence the receptors, would be the parking lots. Thus, only the equipment used for that purpose (graders, loaders, backhoes, etc.) would be operated near the homes for any noticeable length of time. Parking lot construction activities would also be of relatively short duration. As a result, the average noise levels received at the nearest sensitive receptors would be substantially lower than 79 dB Ldn.

Construction activities would be temporary in nature, typically occurring during normal daylight hours. Construction noise impacts could be significant, if extensive nighttime operations occur or unusually noisy equipment were used. These noise impacts could result in annoyance or sleep disruption for nearby rural residences along Wilfred Avenue (including connecting streets) and, to a lesser extent, the mobile home park located along Rohnert Park Expressway. However, the temporary nature of construction noise would result in a less-than-significant impact. Nonetheless, mitigation measures are identified in **Section 5.2.9** that would result in reductions in construction noise impacts.

**TABLE 4.10-1**  
TYPICAL CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS

Type of Equipment	Maximum Noise Level, dBA at 50 feet
Scrapers	85
Bulldozers	85
Heavy Trucks	85
Backhoes	80
Pneumatic Tools	85
Generator	82
Concrete Saw	90
Mounted Impact Hammer	90

SOURCE: BBA, 2004, 2007.

### ***Operational Noise Impacts***

#### *On-Site Operations Noise*

Alternative A will result in on-site operational noise. On-site operations noise would be primarily traffic and parking-related activities in parking lots, use of fans for heating and ventilation (HVAC), truck loading or unloading areas, tour bus parking, wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) operation, and central plant operation.

Noise due to traffic in parking lots would be limited by low speed limits, and as a result, is not expected to represent a substantial source of noise. Human activity in parking lots can produce noise including talking, yelling, and opening and closing of car doors and trunk lids. The noise levels

associated with these activities cannot be precisely defined because of variables such as number of parking movements and the time of day. It is typical for a passing car in a parking lot to produce a maximum noise level of 60 dBA to 65 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, which is comparable to the level of a raised voice. The noise level associated with the idling of a modern diesel bus can be as high as 65 dBA at 50 feet.

The parking areas for Alternative A surround the proposed casino building. The nearest noise-sensitive land uses would be the houses located north and east of the Wilfred site on Wilfred Avenue (see **Figure 3.10-1**). The closest residents would be approximately 50 feet from one or more parking lots. As shown in **Table 4.10-2**, the noise level from passing on-site cars or buses would be 65 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptors. This level is greater than the acceptable noise level of 60 dBA for a short-term on-site noise event, and would therefore be a significant impact to these sensitive receptors. Mitigation measures proposed in **Section 5.2.9** would reduce impacts to sensitive receptors from on-site circulation traffic noise to a less-than-significant level.

**TABLE 4.10-2**  
PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS FROM ON-SITE ACTIVITIES AT SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

Alternative	Noise Source	Nearest Sensitive Receptor Location	Approximate Distance from Noise Source to Nearest Sensitive Receptor, feet	Estimated Sound Level at Nearest Sensitive Receptor, dBA
A	Wastewater Treatment Plant Pumps – not enclosed	Homes at Labath and Wilfred	1150	51
	Wastewater Treatment Plant –enclosed		1150	31
	HVAC on Building		600	32
	Passing Car/Bus		50	65
	Passing Truck at Loading Dock		1200	47*
B	Wastewater Treatment Plant Pumps – not enclosed	Homes on north side of Wilfred	2200	45
	Wastewater Treatment Plant –enclosed		2200	25
	HVAC on Building		900	29
	Passing Car/Bus		115	58
	Passing Truck at Loading Dock		1500	45*
C	Wastewater Treatment Plant Pumps – not enclosed	Homes on east side of Whistler	1750	47*

Alternative	Noise Source	Nearest Sensitive Receptor Location	Approximate Distance from Noise Source to Nearest Sensitive Receptor, feet	Estimated Sound Level at Nearest Sensitive Receptor, dBA
	Wastewater Treatment Plant –enclosed		1750	27*
	HVAC on Building		225	41
	Passing Car/Bus		50	65
	Passing Truck at Loading Dock		850	50*
D	Wastewater Treatment Plant Pumps – not enclosed	Homes on north side of Wilfred	1800	47
	Wastewater Treatment Plant –enclosed		1800	27
	HVAC on Building		625	32
	Passing Car/Bus		100	59
	Passing Truck at Loading Dock		1200	47*
E	Wastewater Treatment Plant Pumps – not enclosed	Homes on north side of Wilfred	2400	44
	Wastewater Treatment Plant –enclosed		2400	24
	HVAC on Building		200	42
	Passing Car/Bus		100	59
	Passing Truck at Loading Dock		500**	55
F	Wastewater Treatment Plant Pumps – not enclosed	Home SE and NE of developed site	3000	43
	Wastewater Treatment Plant –enclosed		3000	23
	HVAC on Building		2300	21
	Passing Car/Bus		1600	35
	Passing Truck at Loading Dock		2500	41
H	Wastewater Treatment Plant Pumps – not enclosed	Homes at Labath and Wilfred	1150	51
	Wastewater Treatment Plant –enclosed		1150	31
	HVAC on Building		600	32
	Passing Car/Bus		50	65
	Passing Truck at Loading Dock		1200	47*

NOTE: \* The loading dock would be shielded from view by buildings, so the actual noise level would be 5 to 10 dB lower than shown.

\*\* No loading dock location has been specified, but a loading dock could be part of an individual building design.

SOURCE: BBA, 2008b.

Parking structure surfaces can cause reflections of sound, so that noise from traffic and human activities could seem magnified, with potential adverse impacts to nearby residents. The proposed parking structure would be located southeast and adjacent to the casino in Alternative A. This would be approximately 500 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors to the northeast along Wilfred Avenue. Maximum noise levels from cars moving in and around the parking structure would be about 37 dBA to 42 dBA at the property line, which would be lower than acceptable levels and therefore a less than significant impact.

The greatest potential for significant noise impacts would occur if fans or similar equipment were located near sensitive receptors. The casino would be equipped with roof mounted HVAC units. These would be located near the casino, which is situated approximately 600 feet from the nearest sensitive receptor, resulting in a noise level at the nearest sensitive receptor of 31 dBA, well below the acceptable noise level of 45 dBA for a continuous on-site noise event. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result.

Loading areas for food and other supplies can be significant noise sources, primarily as a result of noise produced by passing trucks. Although the trucks would be moving at low speeds, the engine noise could be significant (typically 70 dBA to 75 dBA at 50 feet), and the number and time of day of truck deliveries could affect nearby noise-sensitive receivers. Loading docks would be located southwest of the casino building, and would be located approximately 1,200 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors. Maximum noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors due to truck movements at the loading docks would be approximately 47 dBA, well below the acceptable noise level of 60 dBA for a short-term on-site noise event. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result. Nonetheless, mitigation measures in **Section 5.2.9** have been added to further reduce this impact.

Noise from the WWTP and central plant machinery could be significant if these facilities were to be located adjacent to noise-sensitive uses, and if noise levels were to exceed acceptable limits. Note that most noise generating operations of the wastewater treatment plant and central plant would be enclosed except for exterior pumps,. Alternative A plans for these facilities to be located near the southeastern boundary and away from the nearest sensitive receptors. Nonetheless, as show in **Table 4.10-2**, unenclosed wastewater treatment pumps could result in noise levels of 51 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptors along Wilfred Avenue. This is greater than the acceptable noise level of 45 dBA for a continuous on-site noise event and would represent a significant impact. Mitigation measures proposed in **Section 5.2.9** would reduce impacts to sensitive receptors from on-site wastewater treatment plant noise to a less-than-significant level.

*Off-site Traffic Noise*

For the traffic noise impact analysis, it was assumed that worst-case noise exposures would occur at a reference distance of 50 feet from the centerlines of the roadways. Truck mix was estimated from the short-term traffic counts and from Caltrans data. Day-night distribution of traffic noise was estimated as 87% and 13%, respectively. Based upon the traffic analysis prepared for this project (**Appendix O**), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) model was run to predict traffic noise levels for the roadways included in the traffic analysis. **Table 4.10-3** compares the near-term traffic noise levels (at a reference distance of 50 feet from the roadway centerline) with anticipated traffic noise levels after the implementation of Alternative A. **Table 4.10-4** shows the predicted changes in traffic noise levels, as compared with near-term conditions for alternatives located on the Wilfred site. As shown in **Section 3.10.1**, changes in traffic noise levels could be potentially significant when resulting in ambient noise levels greater than 65 dB Ldn or resulting in significant changes to ambient noise levels as shown in **Table 3.10-3**. For comparison, the other project alternatives proposed for the Wilfred and Stony Point (Alt. A, B, C, D, E; H) sites are included in **Tables 4.10-2** and **4.10-3**.

Road segments that are either currently above the 65 dB Ldn land use compatibility criterion or those that would rise above this level with the introduction of project traffic are shown in **Table 4.10-3**. It is assumed that noise sensitive development is present or proposed immediately adjacent to all of the segments that would be above this level and is considered to be a significant impact. Mitigation measures are proposed in **Section 5.2.9** that would reduce traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level (project impacts to baseline conditions would be mitigated, but baseline traffic noise levels may remain greater than 65 dB Ldn).

**TABLE 4.10-3**  
 PREDICTED TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS AT REFERENCE DISTANCES – ALTERNATIVES A-E, H

Roadway	Segment	Predicted L <sub>dn</sub> , dB						
		Near-Term	Alt. A plus Near-Term	Alt. B plus Near-Term	Alt. C plus Near-Term	Alt. D plus Near-Term	Alt. E plus Near-Term	Alt. H plus Near-Term
Rohnert Park Expressway	Labath to Stony Point	69.8	69.8	71.3	69.6	70.9	70.3	69.8
Stony Point Road	Rohnert Park Expressway to Wilfred	73.2	74.1	73.9	74.5	73.7	73.7	73.5
Redwood Drive	Rohnert Park Expressway to Wilfred Avenue	67.4	67.5	67.4	67.5	67.4	67.4	67.4
Commerce	Rohnert Park Expressway to Golf Course	64.7	64.7	64.7	64.7	64.7	64.7	64.7
Wilfred	Stony Point to Whistler	62.1	64.2	64.6	<b>66.5</b>	63.8	63.3	63.5
Wilfred	Whistler to Labath	62.1	64.2	<b>68.8</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>67.6</b>	<b>65.1</b>	63.4
Wilfred	Labath to Dowdell	<b>65.3</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>69.7</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>68.7</b>	<b>66.9</b>	<b>67.6</b>
Wilfred	Dowdell to Redwood	<b>66.4</b>	<b>69.0</b>	<b>70.2</b>	<b>70.5</b>	<b>69.3</b>	<b>67.8</b>	<b>67.9</b>
Wilfred	Redwood to SR101	<b>69.1</b>	<b>70.9</b>	<b>71.5</b>	<b>71.7</b>	<b>70.9</b>	<b>69.9</b>	<b>70.3</b>
Business Park	Labath to Redwood	61.6	58.9	61.6	61.6	61.6	61.6	61.6
Roberts Lake	Commerce to Golf Course	63.8	63.6	63.8	63.8	63.8	63.8	63.6
Millbrae	Stony Point to Primrose	61.7	61.9	62.0	62.1	61.9	61.8	61.8

Note: **Bold** values indicate potentially significant noise levels.

SOURCE: BBA, 2004, 2008b.

Changes in traffic noise levels would exceed off-site traffic significance criteria (see **Table 3.10-3**) at several road segments, as shown in **Table 4.10-4**, resulting in a significant impact. Along Rohnert Park Expressway is a mobile home park, which is considered to be a sensitive receptor for noise impacts. The mobile home park has been designed with a large buffer zone and a sound barrier between the park and Rohnert Park Expressway. Traffic noise from Rohnert Park Expressway is therefore not expected to significantly affect this sensitive receptor. Mitigation measures are provided in **Section 5.2.9** that would reduce traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**TABLE 4.10-4**  
 CHANGES IN PREDICTED TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS  
 AT REFERENCE DISTANCES – ALTERNATIVES A-E, H

Roadway	Segments	Predicted $L_{dn}$ , dB					
		Alt. A minus Near-Term	Alt. B minus Near-Term	Alt. C minus Near-Term	Alt. D minus Near-Term	Alt. E minus Near-Term	Alt. H minus Near-Term
Rohnert Park Expressway	Labath to Stony Point	0.0	<b>1.5</b>	-0.2	1.1	0.5	0.0
Stony Point Road	Rohnert Park Expressway to Wilfred	0.8	0.7	1.2	0.5	0.4	0.2
Redwood Drive	Rohnert Park Expressway to Wilfred Avenue	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Commerce	Rohnert Park Expressway to Golf Course	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wilfred	Stony Point to Whistler	2.1	2.5	<b>4.4</b>	1.7	1.1	1.3
Wilfred	Whistler to Labath	2.0	<b>6.7</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>3.0</b>	1.3
Wilfred	Labath to Dowdell	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>2.3</b>
Wilfred	Dowdell to Redwood	<b>2.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>2.9</b>	1.4	<b>1.5</b>
Wilfred	Redwood to SR101	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	0.7	1.1
Business Park	Labath to Redwood	-2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Roberts Lake	Commerce to Golf Course	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2
Millbrae	Stony Point to Primrose	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1

NOTE: Bold values indicate a potentially significant increase in noise levels.

SOURCE: BBA, 2004, 2008b.

## **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

### **Construction**

There is no reported hazardous materials contamination on the Wilfred site. Thus, known hazardous materials located on the Wilfred site would not affect construction staff or the public. Although not anticipated, the possibility exists that undiscovered contaminated soil and/or groundwater exists on the

Wilfred site and construction staff could encounter contamination during construction-related earth moving activities. If this should happen, it could pose a risk to human health and/or the environment and be considered as a potentially significant impact.

During construction of Alternative A, the demolition of the two existing residential dwellings would be necessary. Although the dwellings are not known to contain asbestos or lead based paint, they appear to be built prior to 1960. Dwellings built prior to 1978 are likely to contain asbestos containing materials (ACMs) and lead based paints. The presence of such ACMs and lead based paint pose a threat to construction workers during demolition and cleanup. Demolition contractors are required by the National Emissions Standards for Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulations to employ Best Management Practices (BMPs); thereby, reduce any potential risks to construction workers. This will reduce any impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are contained in **Sections 5.2.9** and **5.2.3** to further reduce potential impacts from exposure to ACMs and lead based paint.

During grading and construction, the use of hazardous materials would include substances such as gasoline, diesel fuel, motor oil, hydraulic fluid, solvents, cleaners, sealants, welding flux, various lubricants, paint, and paint thinner. These materials would be used for the operation and maintenance of equipment used during the construction. Regular fueling and oiling of construction equipment would be performed daily. Probable hazardous materials releases may involve the dripping of fuels, oil, and grease from construction equipment. These small quantities of fuel, oil, and grease are relatively low toxicity and concentration. No long-term impacts to the soil or groundwater would occur. Typical construction management practices limit and often eliminate the impact of such accidental releases. An accident involving a service or refueling truck would present the worst-case scenario for the release of a hazardous substance. Depending on the relative hazard of the hazardous material, if a spill or leak of significant quantity were to occur, the accidental release could pose a hazard to construction employees as well as to the environment. This impact is potentially significant. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.9** to reduce the significance of the hazardous materials impacts resulting from construction.

### ***Operation***

Should an on-site wastewater treatment option occur, the WWTP would require the delivery, storage, and use of hazardous materials, particularly the use of sodium hypochlorite (bleach) and citric acid (HydroScience, 1999, in AES, 2002). Sodium hypochlorite is used in wastewater treatment, in household laundry detergents, and in photochemical and pulp and paper industries. Sodium hypochlorite ingestion can cause severe gastrointestinal corrosion; inhalation can cause pulmonary edema. Citric acid is used in hair products, household cleaners, and in electroplating, printing, and machinery manufacturing industries. For the proposed wastewater treatment plant, a weak (5% strength) solution of sodium hypochlorite would be used to clean or inhibit biogrowth in the

immersed membranes used to filter out solids. Sodium hypochlorite would be stored in a 55-gallon drum, within a chemical spill containment area inside the wastewater treatment plant building. A citric acid solution is periodically used to remove buildup of inorganic materials. Citric acid is purchased in dry form in 40-pound sacks. A 50-gallon mixing tank inside the wastewater treatment plant would be used to prepare the liquid citric acid solution. Both the sodium hypochlorite and the citric acid are pumped directly to a chemical dip tank when required for use.

Diesel fuel storage tanks will be needed for the operation of four emergency generators at the casino, one emergency generator and one fire pump provided for the hotel, and one emergency generator provided for the wastewater treatment facility. Fuel storage is addressed in **Section 2.9.9**.

During operation of the facilities included under Alternative A, the majority of waste produced would be non-hazardous. The small quantities of hazardous materials that would be utilized would include motor oil, hydraulic fluid, solvents, cleaners, lubricants, paint, and paint thinner. These materials would be utilized for the operation and maintenance of the casino, emergency generators, and other project facilities. The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be generated are common to commercial sites and do not pose unusual storage, handling or disposal issues. A hazardous materials release could occur that would pose a hazard to human health or the environment if these materials are not stored, handled, or disposed of according to state, federal, and manufacturer's guidelines.

The two adjacent leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites have been identified within 0.50 miles of the eastern boundary of the Wilfred site. Remedial activities are ongoing at both sites under the regulatory oversight of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The shallow groundwater aquifer under the LUST sites has been impacted with methyl tertiary-butyl ether (MTBE) and its breakdown product tertiary-butyl ether (TBA). Groundwater pumping from the deep aquifer on the Wilfred site could cause a downward migration of shallow contamination in the LUST site area. This downward migration of contaminants into the deep aquifer could result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation is included in **Section 5.2.2** and **5.2.9** to reduce potentially significant impacts from operation of Alternative A to a less-than-significant level.

The amount and types of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during the operation of Alternative A could have a potentially significant impact to the environment and public. Mitigation is included in **Section 5.2.9** to reduce any impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### ***VISUAL RESOURCES***

The following criteria used to determine if the project would have a significant visual impact:

- obstruction of a scenic view from public viewing areas;

- introduction of physical features that are substantially out of character with existing or planned development in adjacent areas;
- alteration of the natural landscape characteristics of the site of which the scale or degree of change appears as a substantial, obvious, and disharmonious modification of the overall scene, to the extent that it clearly dominates the view; or
- disruption of adjacent residential areas from new nighttime lighting. Criteria for determining significance for lighting and glare impacts to public health and safety under 40 Code of Regulations (CFR) 1508.27 is by the intensity of light that overflows from the site to sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project alternatives.

### ***Impacts Related to Regulatory Setting***

As detailed in **Section 3.8** and noted in **Section 3.10**, the majority of the Wilfred site is located within the Rohnert Park/Santa Rosa Community Separator, including the northeast corner of the site proposed for intensive development under Alternative A. The Land Use Element of the Sonoma County General Plan identifies the importance of preserving open space between the County's cities and communities and maintaining them in a largely open or natural character with low intensities of development. The Open Space element identifies the need to preserve the visual identities of communities by maintaining open space areas between cities and communities. Alternative A would encroach development within the Community Separator in seeming contradiction of this need. However, the development of Alternative A is also located within the City of Rohnert Park's Northwest Specific Plan area, within the City of Rohnert Park's sphere of influence and urban growth boundary, and is currently planned by the City for intensive development. In addition, the visual appearance of a regional commercial activity would be consistent with the regional commercial activities just south and east of the Wilfred site, along Redwood Drive and US-101. Therefore, visual impacts in terms of the land use planning would be less than significant.

### ***Regional Impacts***

The Wilfred site is located adjacent to a regional commercial area along US-101. Construction of Alternative A would incorporate open space that partitions the sphere of influence for the City of Rohnert Park from agricultural and open space areas under County jurisdiction. Also, construction would further serve to partition the area from the community of Cotati located south of the Wilfred site. With clustered regional commerce already in place along the US-101 at and in the vicinity of Wilfred Avenue and Business Park Drive, regional commuters on US-101 would encounter consistent surroundings. Thus, the regional visual impacts under Alternative A would be less than significant.

### ***Impacts to Wilfred Site Viewshed***

Impacts to the Wilfred site viewshed are discussed in terms of impacts within the constituent vistas of the viewshed. While the proposed facilities would be visible, this alone does not constitute an impact. A regional commercial element is generally envisioned for the Northwest Specific Plan Area and the proposed facilities of Alternative A would generally be consistent with such a vision. As shown below, no significant obstructions of views from US-101 would occur, which is designated by the County as a scenic corridor. From most US-101 viewpoints, the proposed development under Alternative A would be mostly or totally obstructed from view or shown as rising slightly above existing commercial development along the US-101 corridor. In addition, the views of the proposed facilities would generally be intermittent. Thus, impacts of the Wilfred site from surrounding viewsheds would be less than significant.

Viewpoints surrounding the Wilfred site are provided and described below:

#### *Vista A – Wilfred Avenue: Residential and Commuter Vista*

**Figure 3.10-10** shows the view to the Wilfred site under existing conditions, from the northeast corner of Wilfred Avenue and Dowdell Avenue, northeast of the proposed construction area.

**Figure 4.10-1** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative A within the same view. Within this vista the residences identified in **Section 3.10** would experience a sustained view of the buildings against a backdrop of commercial development as planned within the guidelines of the City's General Plan and any construction consistent with the Northwest Specific Plan. Westbound commuters on Wilfred Avenue would be offered a dominant view of the proposed facilities upon entering the vista, and would continue observing this view for approximately half a minute until the facilities fall from view at the commuter's left flank.

**Figure 3.10-11** provides a view of the existing conditions from the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel, northwest of the proposed construction area.

**Figure 4.10-2** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative A within the same view. Residents west of the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel would experience a view to the facilities as described above, though the view would be considerably more distanced from the viewer. Upon entering the vista, eastbound commuters would observe the facilities against a backdrop of mountains, trees and commercial development, with the foreground dominating the view. The viewing time on this approach would be approximately one minute, during which the proposed facilities would come to dominate the southward view briefly before it passes out of view to the commuter's right flank.

**Figure 4.10-1**

Figure 4.10-2

*Vista B – Stony Point Road: Commuter Vista*

**Figure 3.10-12** shows the Wilfred site as seen from the corner of Stony Point Road and Wilfred Avenue under existing conditions.

**Figure 4.10-3** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative A within the same view. The proposed facilities would be observed at an appreciable distance, against a backdrop of mountains, trees and commercial development, with the foreground dominating the view. As noted in **Section 3.10**, the southbound Stony Point Road commuter vista is approximately 0.34 miles. While the duration of visibility is dependent upon traffic conditions, deceleration and acceleration time where stoppage is required, an average speed of 50 mph offers approximately half a minute of view to southbound commuters on Stony Point Road, until the proposed construction site falls back from view to the commuter's left flank.

**Figure 3.10-13** shows the Wilfred site as seen from Stony Point Road near the Rohnert Park Expressway under existing conditions.

**Figure 4.10-4** shows the proposed massing of the proposed construction under Alternative A within the same view. The distance of visibility on the northbound passing is approximately 0.7 miles. While the duration of visibility is dependent upon traffic conditions, deceleration and acceleration where stoppage is required, an average speed of 50 mph would offer approximately a one minute view to the proposed construction area before the commuter passes Wilfred Avenue, and the proposed construction area passes from forward-oriented view at the commuter's right flank.

*Vista C – Rohnert Park Expressway: Commuter Vista*

As discussed in **Section 3.10**, only intermittent views of the construction planned under Alternative A would be afforded to commuters on the Rohnert Park Expressway. The placement of the planned construction would be distanced from view relative to near-ground objects, while the impacts of foreshortening would continue to result in near-ground trees and topographical features dominating the view.

*Vista D – Southeast Quadrant: Residential and Business Park Vista*

**Figure 3.10-14** shows the perspective to the construction portion of the Wilfred site under existing conditions, but was taken at the apex of the berm and parallel to the tree line that would normally obstruct views from the street.

**Figure 4.10-3**

**Figure 4.10-4**

**Figure 4.10-5** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative A within the same view. As noted in **Section 3.10**, Vista D provides a limited view northward for the trailer park at Rancho Verde Circle off Rohnert Park Expressway and the business park on Business Park Drive, southeast of the Wilfred site. Within this vista, a view of a portion of the proposed construction on the Wilfred site is afforded to westbound commuters on Business Park Drive, although it is largely obstructed by landscaping and trees along the northern side of the street.

*Vista E – US-101 and Interchange Businesses: Regional Commercial and Commuter Vista*

Regional commuters on US-101 would momentarily observe a portion of the proposed development, which would be consistent with the clustered regional commercial developments already in place along US-101 in the vicinity of Wilfred Avenue.

**Figures 3.10-16 – 3.10-19** show the view of the Wilfred site from US-101 under existing conditions. As noted in **Section 3.10.3**, the Wilfred site only momentarily comes into view for southbound commuters on the elevated portion of US-101 over Commerce Blvd.

**Figures 4.10-6 – 4.10-9** show the massing of the proposed development under Alternative A within the same views. For much of the view from US-101, the proposed development under Alternative A is mostly obstructed due to existing development and vegetation. With the exception of viewpoint RP08, which was taken from a short, elevated section of US-101 in the vicinity of Wilfred Avenue, generally only the top of the hotel is clearly visible from the roadway. The parking structure is also partially visible from RP09 and RP10 (which is actually elevated above US-101), but note that these viewpoints were chosen in part for their ability to provide partially unobstructed views of the proposed development as well as their spacing in the viewshed. Only RP08 offers a momentary view of a large portion of the parking structure and the hotel from an elevated position.

***Lighting and Glare***

Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. A revised design of the casino and hotel has reduced casino façade windows, but increased hotel façade windows (primarily facing north, west, and south), resulting in an overall increase in the potential for glare (at least for viewpoints from the north, west, and south). The hotel façade would be broken up by protruding non-glass architectural features and balconies, reducing the glare that would result from an all-glass tower. Also, the hotel is fairly centered on the northwest corner of the Wilfred site. Thus, with the exception of on-site traffic, glare impacts would be limited to more distant glare and sunlight reflection on cars traveling upon regional roadways. Finally, the hotel is

Figure 4.10-5

*Figure 4.10-6*

*Figure 4.10-7*

*Figure 4.10-8*

*Figure 4.10-9*

oriented so that no regional roadways face the broadest glass faces of the hotel (the north and south faces), with the possible exception of northbound Labath Ave. through the business park, although the view from Labath would be at least partially shaded by surrounding buildings and trees. Nonetheless, the largely glass design of the hotel could result in a significant glare impact to drivers on-site and on surrounding roadways absent mitigation due to the potential for brief, but intense reflections generated by the hotel. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties during the night, this would potentially disrupt nearby residential land uses, wildlife, and contribute to the light pollution currently present within the vicinity of Rohnert Park. Absent mitigation, light from parking lots would be expected to trespass onto adjacent properties, resulting in a significant lighting impact. Mitigation is identified in **Section 5.2.9** that reduces lighting and glare impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### **4.10.2 ALTERNATIVE B – NORTHWEST STONY POINT CASINO**

##### *NOISE*

##### *Construction Noise*

The construction of Alternative B would result in similar noise impacts to those described under Alternative A. Equipment used for construction would generate noise levels as indicated in **Table 4.10-1**. Maximum noise levels from different types of equipment under differing operating conditions could range from 70 dBA to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. Noise from truck traffic would represent the most significant source of noise.

Construction noise impacts could be significant, as extensive nighttime operations or use of unusually noisy equipment could result in annoyance or sleep disruption for nearby rural residences along Wilfred Avenue (including connecting streets) and, to a lesser extent, the mobile home park located along Rohnert Park Expressway. Impacts from construction noise would be less than significant. Mitigation measures are identified in **Section 5.2.9** that would result in further reductions in construction noise impacts.

##### *Operational Noise Impacts*

##### *On-Site Operations Noise*

As with Alternative A, Alternative B has the potential to result in on-site operational noise. On-site operational noise would be primarily traffic and parking-related activities in parking lots, use of fans for HVAC, truck loading or unloading areas, tour bus parking, WWTP operation, and central plant operation.

Alternative B includes parking areas that surround the proposed casino. The nearest noise-sensitive land uses would be the houses located north of the site on Wilfred Avenue, approximately 115 feet away (see **Figure 3.10-1**). As shown in **Table 4.10-2**, the noise level from passing on-site cars and

buses would be 58 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptors. This level is lesser than the acceptable noise level of 60 dBA for a short-term on-site noise event, and would therefore be a less than significant impact.

Parking structure surfaces can cause reflections of sound, so that noise from traffic and human activities could seem magnified, with potential adverse impacts to nearby residents. The proposed parking structure would be located southeast and adjacent to the casino in Alternative B. This would be greater than 700 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors to the north along Wilfred Avenue. Maximum noise levels from cars moving within or near the parking structure would be approximately 37 dBA to 42 dBA at the property line, which would be lower than acceptable levels and therefore a less than significant impact.

The casino buildings would likely be equipped with roof mounted HVAC fans. These fans would be located approximately 900 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors, resulting in a noise level at the nearest sensitive receptor of 29 dBA, well below the acceptable noise level of 45 dBA for a continuous on-site noise event. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result.

Loading docks would be located south of the parking structure and behind the main casino building, approximately 1,500 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors. Maximum noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors due to truck movements at the loading docks would be approximately 45 dBA, well below the acceptable noise level of 60 dBA for a short-term on-site noise event. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result. Nonetheless, mitigation measures in **Section 5.2.9** have been added to further reduce this impact.

Noise from the WWTP and central plant machinery could be significant if these facilities were to be located adjacent to noise-sensitive uses, and if noise levels were to exceed acceptable limits. Note that most noise generating operations of the wastewater treatment plant and central plant would be enclosed except for exterior pumps. Alternative B plans for these facilities to be located near the southern portion of the site and away from the nearest sensitive receptors. Noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors would be 45 dbA, just within the acceptable noise level of 45 dBA for a continuous on-site noise event. Thus, a less-than-significant impact would result.

#### *Off-site Traffic Noise*

The traffic noise impact analysis for Alternative B used the same modeling assumptions as described under Alternative A. **Table 4.10-3** compares the near-term traffic noise levels (at a reference distance of 50 feet from roadway centerline) with anticipated traffic noise levels after the implementation of Alternative B. **Table 4.10-4** shows the predicted changes in traffic noise levels, as compared with near-term conditions for alternatives located on the Stony Point site. As shown in **Section 3.10.1**, changes in traffic noise levels could be potentially significant when resulting in

ambient noise levels greater than 65 dB L<sub>dn</sub> or resulting in significant changes to ambient noise levels as shown in **Table 3.10-3**.

Road segments that are either currently above the 65 dB L<sub>dn</sub> land use compatibility criterion or those that would rise above this level with the introduction of project traffic are shown in **Table 4.10-3**. It is assumed that noise sensitive development is present or proposed immediately adjacent to all of the segments that would be above this level. This is considered to be a significant impact. Mitigation measures are proposed in **Section 5.2.9** that would reduce traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Changes in traffic noise levels would exceed off-site traffic significance criteria (see **Table 3.10-3**) at several road segments, as shown in **Table 4.10-4**, resulting in a significant impact. Along Rohnert Park Expressway is a mobile home park, which is considered to be a sensitive receptor for noise impacts. The mobile home park has been designed with a large buffer zone and a sound barrier between the park and Rohnert Park Expressway. Traffic noise from Rohnert Park Expressway is therefore not expected to significantly affect this sensitive receptor. Mitigation measures are provided in **Section 5.2.9** that would reduce traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

##### **Construction**

There is no reported hazardous materials contamination on the Stony Point site. Thus, known hazardous materials located on the Stony Point site would not affect construction staff or the public. Although not anticipated, the possibility does exist that undiscovered contaminated soil and/or groundwater exists on the Stony Point site and construction staff could encounter contamination during construction-related earth moving activities. If this should happen, it could pose a risk to human health and/or the environment and be considered as a potentially significant impact.

During grading, construction, and maintenance of equipment, the use of hazardous materials would include substances such as gasoline, diesel fuel, motor oil, hydraulic fluid, solvents, cleaners, sealants, welding flux, various lubricants, paint, and paint thinner. Regular fueling and oiling of construction equipment would be performed daily. Probable hazardous materials releases may involve the dripping of fuels, oil, and grease from construction equipment that may drip even from properly maintained vehicles. Such occurrences would occur in relatively low toxicity and concentration and no long-term impact to the soil, or groundwater would occur. Typical construction management practices limit and often eliminate the impact of such accidental releases. An accident involving a service or refueling truck would present the worst-case scenario for the release of a hazardous substance. Depending on the relative hazard of the hazardous material, if a spill or leak of significant quantity were to occur, the accidental release could pose a hazard to construction

employees, as well as to the environment. This impact is potentially significant. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.9** to reduce the significance of the hazardous materials impacts resulting from construction.

### **Operation**

Should an on-site wastewater treatment option occur, the WWTP would require the delivery, storage, and use of hazardous materials, particularly the use of sodium hypochlorite (bleach) and citric acid (HydroScience, 1999, in AES, 2002). Sodium hypochlorite is used in wastewater treatment, in household laundry detergents, and in photochemical and pulp and paper industries. Sodium hypochlorite ingestion can cause severe gastrointestinal corrosion; inhalation can cause pulmonary edema. Citric acid is used in hair products, household cleaners, and in electroplating, printing, and machinery manufacturing industries. For the proposed wastewater treatment plant, a weak (5% strength) solution of sodium hypochlorite would be used to clean or inhibit biogrowth in the immersed membranes used to filter out solids. Sodium hypochlorite would be stored in a 55-gallon drum, within a chemical spill containment area inside the wastewater treatment plant building. A citric acid solution is periodically used to remove buildup of inorganic materials. Citric acid is purchased in dry form in 40-pound sacks. A 50-gallon mixing tank inside the wastewater treatment plant would be used to prepare the liquid citric acid solution. Both the sodium hypochlorite and the citric acid are pumped directly to a chemical dip tank when required for use.

Diesel fuel storage tanks will be needed for the operation of four emergency generators at the casino, one emergency generator and one fire pump provided for the hotel, and one emergency generator provided for the wastewater treatment facility. Fuel storage is addressed in **Section 2.9.9**.

During operation of the facilities included under Alternative B, the majority of waste produced would be non-hazardous. The small quantities of hazardous materials that would be utilized would include motor oil, hydraulic fluid, solvents, cleaners, lubricants, paint, and paint thinner. These materials would be utilized for the operation and maintenance of the casino, emergency generators, and other project facilities. The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be generated are common to commercial sites and do not pose unusual storage, handling or disposal issues. A hazardous materials release could occur that would pose a hazard to human health or the environment if these materials are not stored, handled, or disposed of according to State, Federal, and manufacturer's guidelines.

The two adjacent LUST sites have been identified within 0.50 miles of the eastern boundary of the Wilfred site and approximately 0.75 miles of the eastern edge of the Stony Point site. Remedial activities are ongoing at both LUST sites under the regulatory oversight of the RWQCB. The shallow groundwater aquifer under the LUST sites has been impacted with methyl tertiary-butyl ether (MTBE) and its breakdown product tertiary-butyl ether (TBA). Groundwater pumping from the deep

aquifer on the Wilfred site could cause migration of shallow contamination from the LUST site. This downward migration of contaminants into the deep aquifer could result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation is included in **Section 5.2.2** and **Section 5.2.9** to reduce potentially significant impacts from operation of Alternative B to a less-than-significant level.

The amount and types of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during the operation of Alternative B could have a potentially significant impact to the environment and public. A potentially significant impact would result if a leak or spill were to occur. Mitigation is included in **Section 5.2.9** to reduce any significant impacts to a less-than-significant level for Alternative B.

#### ***VISUAL RESOURCES***

##### ***Impacts Related to Regulatory Setting***

The Sonoma County General Plan defines Use Areas to guide community-centered growth as a part of the County's goals. The Land Use Element of the Sonoma County General Plan identifies the importance of preserving open space between the County's cities and communities and maintaining them in a largely open or natural character with low intensities of development. The Open Space element identifies the need to preserve the visual identities of communities. As detailed in **Section 3.8** and noted in **Section 3.10**, the Stony Point site is located in designated Land Extensive Agriculture (LEA) and Diverse Agriculture (DA) districts, overlapped with the Rohnert Park/Santa Rosa Community Separator. Alternative B proposes to construct a regional commercial enterprise within a community separator, impactively encroaching upon the visual partition between communities as envisioned in the Sonoma County General Plan and confounding the visual boundaries between communities. Therefore, a significant visual impact would occur to open space and community separators as envisioned in the Sonoma County General Plan as a result of Alternative B. Since this impact cannot be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

The Sonoma County Zoning Regulations incorporate the designation of Community Separators in order to preserve such open space from development in support of the County's General Plan. The Zoning districts on the Stony Point site that apply to aesthetic values are "B Combining District 6" and "Scenic Resources Combining District." These districts are defined and explained in **Section 3.8**. The immediate area around the Stony Point site includes the following zone designations: Agriculture and Residential District, Manufactured Home Exclusion Combining District, Rural Residential District and Community Separator. Alternative B proposes construction of a regional commercial activity within a zoned community separator. Thus, a significant visual impact would occur to community separators as envisioned in the Sonoma County Zoning Regulations. Since this impact cannot be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

### ***Regional Impacts***

The Stony Point site is located adjacent to the western boundary of the City of Rohnert Park in Sonoma County. The community of Cotati abuts the southern boundary of Rohnert Park as well and is in the vicinity of the southern boundary of the Stony Point site. The construction of the Alternative B developments would occur in an area where existing development is limited to scattered rural residential development and agricultural uses. The Alternative B developments on the northwest corner of the Stony Point site would be visually inconsistent with the land uses immediately surrounding the development area. This would be a significant impact considering the considerable scope of the proposed developments. Since this impact could not be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

### ***Impacts to Stony Point Site Viewshed***

Impacts to the Stony Point site's viewshed resulting from Alternative B are discussed below in terms of impacts within specific vistas. The view of the proposed facilities from public viewpoints would generally be intermittent and limited to views from surrounding roadways, which are not scenic roadways (except for US-101 which, although designated as a scenic corridor, offers largely urban views in the vicinity of the site). Thus, the visual impact of Alternative B within the below delineated viewsheds would be less than significant.

#### *Vista A – Wilfred Avenue: Residential and Commuter Vista*

The portion of the Stony Point site located west of the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel in Vista A is shown on **Figure 3.10-15** as it appears under existing conditions. **Figure 4.10-10** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative B in the same view. The visual exposure times for residents, westbound commuters and eastbound commuters are similar under this alternative, although the facilities proposed under Alternative B would be in stark visual contrast with surrounding existing and planned land uses.

#### *Vista B – Stony Point Road: Commuter Vista*

**Figure 3.10-12** shows the Stony Point site as seen from the corner of Stony Point Road and Wilfred Avenue. **Figure 4.10-11** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative B within the same view. **Figure 3.10-13** shows the Stony Point site as seen from Rohnert Park Expressway. **Figure 4.10-12** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative B from the same view. The visual exposure times for northbound and southbound commuters are similar under this alternative, although the facilities proposed under Alternative B would be in stark visual contrast with surrounding extant and planned land uses.

Figure 4.10-10

Figure 4.10-11

Figure 4.10-12

*Vista C – Rohnert Park Expressway: Commuter Vista*

As discussed in **Section 3.10**, only intermittent views of the construction planned under Alternative B would be afforded to commuters on the Rohnert Park Expressway, although the relative placement of the development would grant significantly more clarity in line of sight to passing commuters. As with Alternative A, above, the placement of the planned construction would be distanced from view relative to near-ground objects, while the impacts of foreshortening would continue to result in near-ground trees and topographical features dominating the view.

*Vista D – Southeast Quadrant: Residential and Business Park Vista*

**Figure 3.10-14**, above, shows this perspective to the Stony Point site, but was taken at the apex of the berm and parallel to the tree line that normally obstruct views from the street. **Figure 4.10-13** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative B from within the same view. While the view from Business Park drive would be less pronounced under Alternative B, a greater number of residences in the trailer park southeast of the Stony Point site would be exposed to view. The view itself would be that of a regional commercial development surrounded by open space, residential and agricultural land.

*Vista E – US-101 and Interchange Businesses: Regional Commercial and Commuter Vista*

Regional commuters on US-101 would observe the top of the Alternative B hotel, which would be consistent with the clustered regional commercial developments already in place along US-101 in the vicinity of Wilfred Avenue.

**Figures 3.10-16 – 3.10-19** show the view of the Stony Point site from US-101 under existing conditions. As noted in **Section 3.10.3**, the southern portion of the Stony Point site only momentarily comes into view for southbound commuters on the elevated portion of US-101 over Commerce Blvd.

**Figures 4.10-14 – 4.10-17** show the massing of the proposed development under Alternative B within the same views. For all of the views from US-101, the proposed development under Alternative B is mostly obstructed due to existing development and vegetation. Generally only the top of the hotel and in some cases a small portion of the parking garage is clearly visible from the roadway. Alternative B development is completely obstructed by trees and commercial development from viewpoints RP09 and RP10.

***Lighting and Glare***

Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation is identified in **Section 5.2.9** that reduces lighting and glare impacts to a less-than-significant level.

### 4.10.3 ALTERNATIVE C – NORTHEAST STONY POINT SITE

#### *NOISE*

##### *Construction Noise*

Construction noise impacts associated with Alternative C would be similar to those described under the previous alternatives. Mechanical equipment used for construction and construction related traffic would generate noise levels as indicated in **Table 4.10-1**. Maximum noise levels from different types of equipment and under different operating conditions could range from 70 dBA to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. This could result in annoyance or sleep disruption for nearby rural residences along Wilfred Avenue (including connecting streets) and, to a lesser extent, construction-related traffic would impact sensitive receptors along Stony Point Road and Rohnert Park Expressway. However, the temporary nature of construction noise would result in a less-than-significant impact. Mitigation measures are identified in **Section 5.2.9** that would result in further reductions in construction noise impacts.

##### *Operational Noise Impacts*

###### *On-Site Operations Noise*

Operational activities associated with Alternative C will be similar to those described under the previous alternatives. Noise sources such as on-site traffic and parking-related activities in parking lots, use of HVAC systems, truck loading or unloading areas, tour bus idling, wastewater treatment plant operation, and central plant operation could result in an annoyance to nearby sensitive receptors located along Wilfred Avenue.

Alternative C includes parking areas that surround the casino complex. The nearest noise-sensitive land uses would be the houses located on the east side of Whistler (see **Figure 3.10-1**). The closest residents would be approximately 50 feet from one or more parking lots. As shown in **Table 4.10-2**, the noise level from passing on-site cars or buses would be 65 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptors. This level is greater than the acceptable noise level of 60 dBA for a short-term on-site noise event, and would therefore be a significant impact to these sensitive receptors. Mitigation measures proposed in **Section 5.2.9** would reduce impacts to sensitive receptors from on-site circulation traffic noise to a less-than-significant level.

Parking structure surfaces can cause reflections of sound, so that noise from traffic and human activities could seem magnified, with potential adverse impacts to nearby residents. The proposed parking structure under Alternative C would be located adjacent to the casino, along the eastern side. This would be greater than a 700-foot distance from the nearest sensitive receptors to the north. Maximum noise levels from cars moving within or near the parking structure would be

Figure 4.10-13

Figure 4.10-14

Figure 4.10-15

Figure 4.10-16

Figure 4.10-17

approximately 37 dBA to 42 dBA at the property line. which would be lower than acceptable levels and therefore a less than significant impact.

The greatest potential for significant noise impacts would occur if fans or similar equipment were located near sensitive receptors. All proposed buildings would be equipped with roof mounted HVAC units that can be noise sources. The HVAC equipment would be sited at least 225 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors, resulting in a noise level at the nearest sensitive receptor of 41 dBA, well below the acceptable noise level of 45 dBA for a continuous on-site noise event. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result.

Loading dock activity can result in noise levels in the range of 70 dBA to 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. At this distance, noise could adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors. Loading docks would be located on the side of the casino facing away from Wilfred Avenue, approximately 850 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors. Maximum noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors due to truck movements at the loading docks would be approximately 50 dBA, well below the acceptable noise level of 60 dBA for a short-term on-site noise event. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result. Nonetheless, mitigation measures in **Section 5.2.9** have been added to further reduce this impact.

Noise from the WWTP and central plant machinery could be significant if these facilities were to be located adjacent to noise-sensitive uses, and if noise levels were to exceed normally acceptable limits. Note that most noise generating operations of the wastewater treatment plant and central plant would be enclosed except for exterior pumps,. In Alternative C, these facilities would be located far from the nearest sensitive uses. Nonetheless, as show in **Table 4.10-2**, unenclosed wastewater treatment pumps could result in noise levels of 47 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptors along Whistler. This is greater than the acceptable noise level of 45 dBA for a continuous on-site noise event and would represent a significant impact. Mitigation measures proposed in **Section 5.2.9** would reduce impacts to sensitive receptors from on-site wastewater treatment plant noise to a less-than-significant level.

#### *Off-site Traffic Noise*

The traffic noise impact analysis for Alternative C used the same modeling assumptions as described under the previous alternatives. **Table 4.10-3** compares the near-term traffic noise levels (at a reference distance of 50 feet from roadway centerline) with anticipated traffic noise levels after the implementation of Alternative C. **Table 4.10-4** shows the predicted changes in traffic noise levels, as compared with near-term conditions for alternatives located on the Stony Point site. As shown in **Section 3.10.1**, changes in traffic noise levels could be potentially significant when resulting in ambient noise levels greater than 65 dB Ldn or resulting in significant changes to ambient noise levels as shown in **Table 3.10-3**.

Road segments that are either currently above the 65 dB L<sub>dn</sub> land use compatibility criterion or those that would rise above this level with the introduction of project traffic are shown in **Table 4.10-3**. It is assumed that noise sensitive development is present or proposed immediately adjacent to all of the segments that would be above this level. This is considered to be a significant impact. Mitigation measures are proposed in **Section 5.2.9** that would reduce traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Changes in traffic noise levels would exceed off-site traffic significance criteria (see **Table 3.10-3**) at several road segments, as shown in **Table 4.10-4**, resulting in a significant impact. Along Rohnert Park Expressway is a mobile home park, which is considered to be a sensitive receptor for noise impacts. The mobile home park has been designed with a large buffer zone and a sound barrier between the park and Rohnert Park Expressway. Traffic noise from Rohnert Park Expressway is not expected to significantly affect this sensitive receptor. Mitigation measures are provided in **Section 5.2.9** that would reduce traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### ***HAZARDOUS MATERIALS***

##### ***Construction***

Potentially significant impacts are the same as those described under Alternative B; refer to the hazardous materials discussion under Alternative B above. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.9** to reduce the hazardous materials impacts to less than significant.

##### ***Operation***

The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative C are the same as those described under Alternative B. **Refer to Section 4.10.2** above. Groundwater pumping would be lessened as a result of the smaller development area proposed for Alternative C; nevertheless, groundwater pumping could potentially cause migration of contaminated groundwater from the adjacent LUST sites. This downward migration of contaminants into the deep aquifer could result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation is included in **Section 5.2.2** and **Section 5.2.9** to reduce potentially significant impacts from hazardous materials during operation of Alternative C to a less-than-significant level.

#### ***VISUAL RESOURCES***

##### ***Impacts Related to Regulatory Setting***

The Sonoma County General Plan defines Use Areas to guide community-centered growth as a part of the County's goals. The Land Use Element of the Plan identifies the importance of preserving open space between the County's cities and communities and maintaining them in a largely open or natural character with low intensities of development. The Open Space element identifies the need to preserve the visual identities of communities by maintaining open space areas between cities and

communities. As detailed in **Section 3.8** and noted in **Section 3.10**, the Stony Point site is located in a classified Open Space – Agriculture and Resource Management area, overlapped with the Rohnert Park/Santa Rosa Community Separator. Alternative C proposes to construct a regional commercial enterprise within a community separator, impactively encroaching upon the visual partition between communities as envisioned in the Sonoma County General Plan. Therefore, a significant visual impact to open space and community separators as envisioned in the Sonoma County General Plan would result from the construction of Alternative C. Since this impact cannot be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

The Sonoma County Zoning Regulations incorporate the designation of Community Separator in order to preserve such open space from development in support of the County's General Plan. The Zoning districts on the Stony Point site that apply to aesthetic values are "B Combining District 6" and "Scenic Resources Combining District." These districts are defined and explained in **Section 3.8**. The immediate area around the Stony Point site includes the following zone designations: Agriculture and Residential District, Manufactured Home Exclusion Combining District, Rural Residential District and Community Separator. Alternative C proposes construction of a regional commercial activity within a zoned community separator. Thus, a significant visual impact would occur to community separators as envisioned in the Sonoma County Zoning Regulations. Since this impact cannot be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

### ***Regional Impacts***

The Stony Point site is located adjacent to the western boundary of the City of Rohnert Park in southern Sonoma County. The community of Cotati abuts the southern boundary of Rohnert Park as well and is in the vicinity of the southern boundary of the Stony Point site. The construction of the Alternative C developments would occur in an area where existing development is limited to scattered rural residential development and agricultural uses. The Alternative C developments on the northeast corner of the Stony Point site would be visually inconsistent with the land uses immediately surrounding the development area. This would be a significant impact considering the considerable scope of the proposed developments. Since this impact could not be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

### ***Impacts to Stony Point Site Viewshed***

Impacts to the Stony Point site's viewshed resulting from Alternative C are discussed below in terms of impacts within specific vistas. The view of the proposed facilities from public viewpoints would generally be intermittent and limited to views from surrounding roadways, which are not scenic roadways (except for US-101 which, although designated as a scenic corridor, offers largely urban views in the vicinity of the site). Thus, the visual impact of Alternative C within the below delineated viewsheds would be less than significant.

Figure 4.10-18

*Vista A – Wilfred Avenue: Residential and Commuter Vista*

The portion of the Stony Point site located east of the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel in Vista A is shown on **Figure 3.10-11**. **Figure 4.10-18** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative C within the same view. The visual exposure times for residents, westbound commuters and eastbound commuters are similar under this alternative, although the facilities proposed under Alternative C would be in stark visual contrast with surrounding extant and planned land uses.

*Vista B – Stony Point Road: Commuter Vista*

**Figure 3.10-12** shows the Stony Point site as seen from the corner of Stony Point Road and Wilfred Avenue. **Figure 4.10-19** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative C from within the same view. **Figure 3.10-13** shows the Stony Point site as seen from Stony Point Road near the Rohnert Park Expressway. **Figure 4.10-20** shows the proposed construction under Alternative C from within the same view. The visual exposure times for northbound and southbound commuters are similar under this alternative, although the facilities proposed under Alternative C would be in stark visual contrast with surrounding extant and planned land uses.

*Vista C – Rohnert Park Expressway: Commuter Vista*

As discussed in **Section 3.10**, only intermittent views of the construction planned under Alternative C would be afforded to commuters on the Rohnert Park Expressway. As with the alternatives above, the placement of the planned construction would be distanced from view relative to near-ground objects, while the impacts of foreshortening would continue to result in near-ground trees and topographical features dominating the view.

*Vista D – Southeast Quadrant: Residential and Business Park Vista*

**Figure 3.10-14**, above, shows this perspective to the Stony Point site, but was taken at the apex of the berm and parallel to the tree line that normally obstruct views from the street. **Figure 4.10-21** shows the proposed construction under Alternative C from within the same view. While the view from Business Park drive would be more pronounced under Alternative C than under Alternative B, and a greater number of residences in the trailer park southeast of the Stony Point site would be exposed to view than would be the case under Alternative A. The view itself would be that of a regional commercial development surrounded by open space, residential and agricultural land.

*Vista E – US-101 and Interchange Businesses: Regional Commercial and Commuter Vista*

Regional commuters on US-101 would observe the top of the Alternative C hotel, which would be consistent with the clustered regional commercial developments already in place along US-101 in the vicinity of Wilfred Avenue.

**Figures 3.10-16 – 3.10-19** show the view of the Stony Point site from US-101 under existing conditions. As noted in **Section 3.10.3**, the southern portion of the Stony Point site only momentarily comes into view for southbound commuters on the elevated portion of US-101 over Commerce Blvd.

**Figures 4.10-22 – 4.10-25** show the massing of the proposed development under Alternative C within the same views. For all of the views from US-101, the proposed development under Alternative C is mostly obstructed due to existing development and vegetation. Generally only the top of the hotel and a small portion of the parking garage is clearly visible from the roadway (and the parking garage view shown in **Figure 4.10-25** would likely not be visible from US-101 given that the RP10 photo was taken from the Rohnert Park Expressway overcrossing at an elevation from the roadway). Alternative C development is completely obstructed by trees and commercial development from viewpoint RP09.

#### ***Lighting and Glare***

Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation is identified in **Section 5.2.9** that reduces lighting and glare impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Figure 4.10-19

Figure 4.10-20

Figure 4.10-21

Figure 4.10-22

Figure 4.10-23

Figure 4.10-24

Figure 4.10-25

#### 4.10.4 ALTERNATIVE D – REDUCED INTENSITY (STONY POINT SITE)

##### *NOISE*

##### *Construction Noise*

Construction activities associated with Alternative D would be similar to those described under the previous alternatives. Mechanical equipment used for construction and construction-related traffic would generate noise levels as indicated in **Table 4.10-1**. Maximum noise levels from different types of equipment and under different operating conditions could range from 70 dBA to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. This could result in annoyance or sleep disruption for nearby rural residences along Wilfred Avenue (including connecting streets) and, to a lesser extent, construction-related traffic would impact sensitive receptors along Stony Point Road and Rohnert Park Expressway. However, the temporary nature of construction noise would result in a less-than-significant impact. Mitigation measures are identified in **Section 5.2.9** that would result in further reductions in construction noise impacts.

##### *Operational Noise Impacts*

##### *On-Site Operations Noise*

Operational activities associated with Alternative D would be similar to those described under the previous alternatives. Noise sources such as on-site traffic and parking-related activities in parking lots, use of fans for HVAC systems, truck loading or unloading areas, tour bus idling, wastewater treatment plant operation, and central plant operation may result in an annoyance to nearby sensitive receptors located along Wilfred Avenue.

Alternative D includes parking areas that surround the proposed casino. The nearest noise-sensitive land uses would be the houses located north of the Stony Point site along Wilfred Avenue approximately 100 feet away (see **Figure 3.10-1**). As shown in **Table 4.10-2**, the noise level from passing on-site cars and buses would be 59 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptors. This level is lesser than the acceptable noise level of 60 dBA for a short-term on-site noise event, and would therefore be a less than significant impact.

Parking structure surfaces can cause reflections of sound, so that noise from traffic and human activities could seem magnified, with potential adverse impacts to nearby residents. The proposed parking structure under Alternative D would be located adjacent to the casino along the eastern side. This would be greater than a 700-foot distance from the nearest sensitive receptors to the north. Maximum noise levels from cars moving within or near the parking structure would be approximately 37 dBA to 42 dBA at the property line, which would be lower than acceptable levels and therefore a less than significant impact.

The casino buildings would likely be equipped with roof mounted HVAC fans. These fans would be located approximately 625 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors, resulting in a noise level at the nearest sensitive receptor of 32 dBA, well below the acceptable noise level of 45 dBA for a continuous on-site noise event. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result.

Loading docks would be located on the opposite side of the building away from Wilfred Avenue, approximately 1,200 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors. Maximum noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors due to truck movements at the loading docks would be approximately 47 dBA, well below the acceptable noise level of 60 dBA for a short-term on-site noise event. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result. Nonetheless, mitigation measures in **Section 5.2.9** have been added to further reduce this impact.

Noise from the WWTP and the central plant machinery could be significant if these facilities were to be located adjacent to noise-sensitive uses, and if noise levels were to exceed acceptable limits. Note that most noise generating operations of the wastewater treatment plant and central plant would be enclosed except for exterior pumps,. In Alternative D, these facilities would be located far from the nearest sensitive uses, near the southeastern boundary of the site, and would be shielded by landscaping, the casino building, and the parking structure to the north. Noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors would be 47 dbA, greater than the acceptable noise level of 45 dBA for a continuous on-site noise event. Thus, a significant impact would result. Mitigation measures proposed in **Section 5.2.9** would reduce impacts to sensitive receptors from on-site wastewater treatment plant noise to a less-than-significant level.

#### *Off-site Traffic Noise*

The traffic noise impact analysis for Alternative D used the same modeling assumptions as described under the previous alternatives. **Table 4.10-3** compares the near-term traffic noise levels (at a reference distance of 50 feet from roadway centerline) with anticipated traffic noise levels after the implementation of Alternative D. **Table 4.10-4** shows the predicted changes in traffic noise levels, as compared with near-term conditions for alternatives located on the Stony Point site. As shown in **Section 3.10.1**, changes in traffic noise levels could be potentially significant when resulting in ambient noise levels greater than 65 dB Ldn or resulting in significant changes to ambient noise levels as shown in **Table 3.10-3**.

Road segments that are either currently above the 65 dB Ldn land use compatibility criterion or those that would rise above this level with the introduction of project traffic are shown in **Table 4.10-4**. It is assumed that noise sensitive development is present or proposed immediately adjacent to all of the segments that would be above this level, and is considered to be a significant impact. Mitigation measures are proposed in **Section 5.2.9** that would reduce traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Changes in traffic noise levels would exceed off-site traffic significance criteria (see **Table 3.10-3**) at several road segments, as shown in **Table 4.10-4**, resulting in a significant impact. A mobile home park is located along Rohnert Park Expressway and is considered to be a sensitive receptor for noise impacts. The mobile home park has been designed with a large buffer zone and a sound barrier between the park and Rohnert Park Expressway. Traffic noise from Rohnert Park Expressway is therefore not expected to significantly affect this sensitive receptor. Mitigation measures are provided in **Section 5.2.9** that would traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### ***HAZARDOUS MATERIALS***

##### ***Construction***

Potentially significant impacts are similar to those described under Alternative B; although on a smaller scale due to the reduced intensity of Alternative D. Refer to the hazardous materials discussion under Alternative B above. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.9** to reduce hazardous materials impacts to less than significant.

##### ***Operation***

The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative D would be similar to those described under Alternative B. **Refer to Section 4.10.2** above. Groundwater pumping would be lessened as a result of the smaller development area proposed for Alternative D; nevertheless, groundwater pumping could potentially cause migration of contaminated groundwater from the adjacent LUST sites. This downward migration of contaminants into the deep aquifer could result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation is included in the **Section 5.2.2** and **Section 5.2.9** to reduce potentially significant impacts from hazardous materials during operation of Alternative D to a less-than-significant level.

#### ***VISUAL RESOURCES***

##### ***Impacts Related to Regulatory Setting***

The Sonoma County General Plan defines Use Areas to guide community-centered growth as a part of the County's goals. The Land Use Element of the Plan identifies the importance of preserving open space between the County's cities and communities and maintaining them in a largely open or natural character with low intensities of development. The Open Space element identifies the need to preserve the visual identities of communities. As detailed in **Section 3.8** and noted in **Section 3.10**, the Stony Point site is located in a classified Open Space – Agriculture and Resource Management area, overlapped with the Rohnert Park/Santa Rosa Community Separator. Alternative D proposes to construct a regional commercial enterprise within a community separator, impactively encroaching upon the visual partition between communities as envisioned in the Sonoma County General Plan. Therefore, a significant visual impact to open space and community separators as envisioned in the

Sonoma County General Plan would result from the construction of Alternative D. Since this impact cannot be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

The Sonoma County Zoning Regulations incorporate the designation of Community Separator in order to preserve such open space from development in support of the County's General Plan. The Zoning districts on the Stony Point site that apply to aesthetic values are "B Combining District 6" and "Scenic Resources Combining District." These districts are defined and explained in **Section 3.8**. The immediate area around the Stony Point site includes the following zone designations: Agriculture and Residential District, Manufactured Home Exclusion Combining District, Rural Residential District and Community Separator. Alternative D proposes construction of a regional commercial activity within a zoned community separator. Thus, a significant visual impact would occur to community separators as envisioned in the Sonoma County Zoning Regulations. Since this impact cannot be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

### ***Regional Impacts***

The Stony Point site is located adjacent to the western boundary of the City of Rohnert Park in southern Sonoma County. The community of Cotati abuts the southern boundary of Rohnert Park as well and is in the vicinity of the southern boundary of the Stony Point site. The construction of the Alternative D developments would occur in an area where existing development is limited to scattered rural residential development and agricultural uses. The Alternative D developments on the northwest corner of the Stony Point site would be visually inconsistent with the land uses immediately surrounding the development area. This would be a significant impact considering the considerable scope of the proposed developments. Since this impact could not be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

### ***Impacts to Stony Point Site Viewshed***

Impacts to the Stony Point site's viewshed resulting from Alternative D are discussed below in terms of impacts within specific vistas. The view of the proposed facilities from public viewpoints would generally be intermittent and limited to views from surrounding roadways, which are not scenic roadways (except for US-101 which, although designated as a scenic corridor, offers largely urban views in the vicinity of the site). Thus, the visual impact of Alternative D within the below delineated viewsheds would be less than significant.

#### ***Vista A – Wilfred Avenue: Residential and Commuter Vista***

The portion of the Stony Point site located west of the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel in Vista A is shown on **Figure 3.10-15** as it appears under existing conditions. **Figure 4.10-26** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative D within the same view. The visual exposure times for residents, westbound commuters and eastbound commuters are similar under this alternative,

Figure 4.10-26

although the facilities proposed under Alternative D would be in stark visual contrast with surrounding extant and planned land uses.

*Vista B – Stony Point Road: Commuter Vista*

**Figure 3.10-12** shows the Stony Point site as seen from the corner of Stony Point Road and Wilfred Avenue. **Figure 4.10-27** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative D from within the same view. **Figure 3.10-13** shows the Stony Point site as seen from Stony Point Road near the Rohnert Park Expressway. **Figure 4.10-28** shows the proposed construction under Alternative D from within the same view. The visual exposure times for northbound and southbound commuters are similar under this alternative, although the facilities proposed under Alternative B would be in stark visual contrast with surrounding extant and planned land uses.

*Vista C – Rohnert Park Expressway: Commuter Vista*

As discussed in **Section 3.10**, only intermittent views of the construction planned under Alternative D would be afforded to commuters on the Rohnert Park Expressway, although the relative placement of the development would grant significantly more clarity in line of sight to passing commuters. As with the alternatives above, the placement of the planned construction would be distanced from view relative to near-ground objects, while the impacts of foreshortening would continue to result in near-ground trees and topographical features dominating the view.

*Vista D – Southeast Quadrant: Residential and Business Park Vista*

**Figure 3.10-14**, above, shows this perspective to the Stony Point site, but was taken at the apex of the berm and parallel to the tree line that normally obstruct views from the street. **Figure 4.10-29** shows the proposed construction under Alternative D from within the same view. While the view from Business Park drive would be less pronounced under Alternative D than under Alternatives A and C, a greater number of residences in the trailer park southeast of the Stony Point site would be exposed to view. The view itself would be that of a business park development surrounded by open space, residential and agricultural land.

*Vista E – US-101 and Interchange Businesses: Regional Commercial and Commuter Vista*

Regional commuters on US-101 would observe the top of the Alternative D hotel, which would be consistent with the clustered regional commercial developments already in place along US-101 in the vicinity of Wilfred Avenue.

**Figures 3.10-16 – 3.10-19** show the view of the Stony Point site from US-101 under existing conditions. As noted in **Section 3.10.3**, the southern portion of the Stony Point site only momentarily comes into view for southbound commuters on the elevated portion of US-101 over Commerce Blvd.

**Figures 4.10-30 – 4.10-33** show the massing of the proposed development under Alternative D within the same views. For all of the views from US-101, the proposed development under Alternative D is mostly obstructed due to existing development and vegetation. Generally only the top of the hotel and in some cases a small portion of the parking garage is clearly visible from the roadway. Alternative D development is completely obstructed by trees and commercial development from viewpoint RP09.

### ***Lighting and Glare***

Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation is identified in **Section 5.2.9** that reduces lighting and glare impacts to a less than significant level.

## **4.10.5 ALTERNATIVE E – BUSINESS PARK**

### ***NOISE***

#### ***Construction Noise***

Construction activities associated with Alternative E would be similar to those described under the previous alternatives. Mechanical equipment used for construction and construction related traffic would generate noise levels as indicated in **Table 4.10-1**. Maximum noise levels from different types of equipment and under different operating conditions could range from 70 dBA to 90 dBA at a distance of 50-feet which could result in annoyance or sleep disruption for nearby rural residences along Wilfred Avenue (including connecting streets) and, to a lesser extent, sensitive receptors along Stony Point Road and Rohnert Park Expressway. However, the temporary nature of construction noise would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Impacts from construction noise would be less than significant. Mitigation measures are identified in **Section 5.2.9** that would further result in reductions in construction noise impacts.

#### ***Operational Noise Impacts***

##### ***On-Site Operations Noise***

On-site operational activities associated with Alternative E would be similar to those described under the previous alternatives. Noise sources such as on-site traffic and parking-related activities in parking lots, use of HVAC systems, truck loading or unloading areas, WWTP operation, and central plant operation could result in an annoyance to nearby sensitive receptors located along Wilfred Avenue.

Figure 4.10-27

Figure 4.10-28

Figure 4.10-29

Figure 4.10-30

Figure 4.10-31

Figure 4.10-32

Figure 4.10-33

The parking area for Alternative E is situated along Wilfred Avenue, with a large portion of the parking area located south of the proposed business park. The nearest noise-sensitive land uses would be the houses located north of the Stony Point site on Wilfred Avenue. These houses would be as close as 100 feet to the proposed parking lots. As shown in **Table 4.10-2**, the noise level from passing on-site cars and buses would be 59 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptors. This level is lesser than the acceptable noise level of 60 dBA for a short-term on-site noise event, and would therefore be a less than significant impact.

The greatest potential for significant noise impacts would occur if HVAC fans or similar equipment were located near sensitive receptors. The buildings within the business park would be equipped with roof mounted HVAC fans. These fans would be located approximately 200 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors, resulting in a noise level at the nearest sensitive receptor of 42 dBA, below the acceptable noise level of 45 dBA for a continuous on-site noise event. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result.

Loading dock activity can result in noise levels in the range of 70 dBA to 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. Loading docks would be located on the opposite side of the building away from Wilfred Avenue and would be located more than 500 feet from the nearest noise-sensitive use to the north. Maximum noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors due to truck movements at the loading docks would be approximately 55 dBA, well below the acceptable noise level of 60 dBA for a short-term on-site noise event. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result. Nonetheless, mitigation measures in **Section 5.2.9** have been added to further reduce this impact.

Noise from the WWTP and the central plant machinery could be significant if these facilities were to be located adjacent to noise-sensitive uses, and if noise levels were to exceed acceptable limits. Note that most noise generating operations of the wastewater treatment plant and central plant would be enclosed except for exterior pumps,. In Alternative E, these facilities would be located far from the nearest sensitive uses near the southeastern boundary of the site, and would be shielded by the landscaping and the on-site buildings to the north. Noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors would be 44 dbA, just within the acceptable noise level of 45 dBA for a continuous on-site noise event. Thus, a less-than-significant impact would result.

#### *Off-site Traffic Noise*

The traffic noise impact analysis for Alternative E used the same modeling assumptions as described under the previous alternatives. **Table 4.10-3** compares the near-term traffic noise levels (at a reference distance of 50 feet from roadway centerline) with anticipated traffic noise levels after the implementation of Alternative E. **Table 4.10-4** shows the predicted changes in traffic noise levels, as compared with near-term conditions for Alternative E. As shown in **Section 3.10.1**, changes in

traffic noise levels could be potentially significant when resulting in ambient noise levels greater than 65 dB Ldn or resulting in significant changes to ambient noise levels as shown in **Table 3.10-3**.

Road segments that are either currently above the 65 dB Ldn land use compatibility criterion or those that would rise above this level with the introduction of project traffic are shown in **Table 4.10-3**. It is assumed that noise sensitive development is present or proposed immediately adjacent to all of the segments that would be above this level and is considered to be a significant impact. Mitigation measures are proposed in **Section 5.2.9** that would reduce traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Changes in traffic noise levels would exceed off-site traffic significance criteria (see **Table 3.10-3**) at several road segments, as shown in **Table 4.10-4**, resulting in a significant impact. Along Rohnert Park Expressway is a mobile home park, which is considered to be a sensitive receptor for noise impacts. The mobile home park has been designed with a large buffer zone and a sound barrier between the park and Rohnert Park Expressway. Traffic noise from Rohnert Park Expressway is therefore not expected to significantly affect this sensitive receptor. Mitigation measures are provided in **Section 5.2.9** that would traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

## ***HAZARDOUS MATERIALS***

### ***Construction***

Potentially significant impacts are similar to those described under Alternative B; please refer to the hazardous materials discussion in **Section 4.10.2**. Under Alternative E, substantially less construction would take place, thus potential for impacts would be slightly lessened. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.9** to reduce the significance of the hazardous materials impacts.

### ***Operation***

The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative E are similar to those described under Alternative B. Groundwater pumping would be lessened as a result of the smaller development area proposed for Alternative E; nevertheless, groundwater pumping could potentially cause migration of contaminated groundwater from adjacent LUST sites. This downward migration of contaminants into the deep aquifer could result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation is included in the **Section 5.2.2** and **Section 5.2.9** to reduce potentially significant impacts from hazardous materials during operation of Alternative E to a less-than-significant level.

***VISUAL RESOURCES***

***Impacts Related to Regulatory Setting***

The Sonoma County General Plan defines Use Areas to guide community-centered growth as a part of the County's goals. The Land Use Element of the Plan identifies the importance of preserving open space between the County's cities and communities and maintaining them in a largely open or natural character with low intensities of development. The Open Space element identifies the need to preserve the visual identities of communities. As detailed in **Section 3.8** and noted in **Section 3.10**, the Stony Point site is located in a classified Open Space – Agriculture and Resource Management area, overlapped with the Rohnert Park/Santa Rosa Community Separator. Alternative E proposes to construct a business park within a community separator, impactively encroaching upon the visual partition between communities as envisioned in the Sonoma County General Plan. Therefore, a significant visual impact to open space and community separators as envisioned in the Sonoma County General Plan would result from the construction of Alternative E. Since this impact cannot be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

The Sonoma County Zoning Regulations incorporate the designation of Community Separators in order to preserve such open space from development in support of the County's General Plan. The Zoning districts on the Stony Point site that apply to aesthetic values are "B Combining District 6" and "Scenic Resources Combining District." These districts are defined and explained in **Section 3.8**. The immediate area around the Stony Point site includes the following zone designations: Agriculture and Residential District, Manufactured Home Exclusion Combining District, Rural Residential District and Community Separator. Alternative E proposes construction of a business park within a zoned community separator. Thus, a significant visual impact would occur to community separators as envisioned in the Sonoma County Zoning Regulations. Since this impact cannot be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

***Regional Impacts***

The Stony Point site is located adjacent to the western boundary of the City of Rohnert Park in southern Sonoma County. The community of Cotati abuts the southern boundary of Rohnert Park as well and is in the vicinity of the southern boundary of the Stony Point site. The construction of the Alternative E developments would occur in an area where existing development is limited to scattered rural residential development and agricultural uses. The Alternative E developments on the northwest corner of the Stony Point site would be visually inconsistent with the land uses immediately surrounding the development area. This would be a significant impact considering the considerable scope of the proposed developments. Since this impact could not be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

***Impacts to Stony Point Site Viewshed***

Impacts to the Stony Point site's viewshed resulting from Alternative E are discussed below in terms of impacts within specific vistas. The view of the proposed facilities from public viewpoints would generally be intermittent and limited to views from surrounding roadways, which are not scenic roadways (except for US-101 which, although designated as a scenic corridor, offers largely urban views in the vicinity of the site). Thus, the visual impact of Alternative E within the below delineated viewsheds would be less than significant.

*Vista A – Wilfred Avenue: Residential and Commuter Vista*

The portion of the Stony Point site located west of the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel in Vista A is shown on **Figure 3.10-15** as it appears under existing conditions. **Figure 4.10-34** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative E within the same view.

*Vista B – Stony Point Road: Commuter Vista*

**Figure 3.10-12** shows the Stony Point site as seen from the corner of Stony Point Road and Wilfred Avenue. **Figure 4.10-35** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative E from within the same view. **Figure 3.10-13** shows the Stony Point site as seen from Stony Point Road near the Rohnert Park Expressway. **Figure 4.10-36** shows the proposed construction under Alternative E from within the same view.

Figure 4.10-34

Figure 4.10-35

*Vista C – Rohnert Park Expressway: Commuter Vista*

As discussed in **Section 3.10**, only intermittent views of the construction planned under Alternative E would be afforded to commuters on the Rohnert Park Expressway, although the relative placement of the development would grant significantly more clarity in line of sight to passing commuters. As with the alternatives above, the placement of the planned construction would be distanced from view relative to near-ground objects, while the impacts of foreshortening would continue to result in near-ground trees and topographical features dominating the view.

*Vista D – Southeast Quadrant: Residential and Business Park Vista*

**Figure 3.10-14**, above, shows this perspective to the Stony Point site, but was taken at the apex of the berm and parallel to the tree line that normally obstruct views from the street. **Figure 4.10-37** shows the proposed construction under Alternative E from within the same view.

*Vista E – US-101 and Interchange Businesses: Regional Commercial and Commuter Vista*

Regional commuters on US-101 would not observe the Alternative D development from any of the US-101 viewpoints.

**Figures 3.10-16 – 3.10-19** show the view of the Stony Point site from US-101 under existing conditions. As noted in **Section 3.10.3**, the southern portion of the Stony Point site only momentarily comes into view for southbound commuters on the elevated portion of US-101 over Commerce Blvd.

**Figures 4.10-38 – 4.10-41** show the massing of the proposed development under Alternative E within the same views. For all of the views from US-101, the proposed development under Alternative E is completely obstructed due to existing development and vegetation.

***Lighting and Glare***

Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation is identified in **Section 5.2.9** that reduces lighting and glare impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Figure 4.10-36

Figure 4.10-37

Figure 4.10-38

Figure 4.10-39

Figure 4.10-40

Figure 4.10-41

#### 4.10.6 ALTERNATIVE F – LAKEVILLE CASINO

##### *Construction Noise*

During the construction phase of Alternative F, noise from construction would dominate the noise environment in the immediate area. Equipment used for construction would generate noise levels as indicated in **Table 4.10-1**. Maximum noise levels from different types of equipment and under different operating conditions could range from 70 dBA to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. The most important project-generated construction traffic noise source would be truck traffic associated with transport of heavy materials and equipment. Construction activities would be temporary in nature, typically occurring during normal working hours. Construction noise impacts could be significant, as extensive nighttime operations or use of unusually noisy equipment could result in annoyance or sleep disruption for nearby rural residences along State Highway 37 and Lakeville Road. However, the temporary nature of construction noise would result in a less-than-significant impact. Nonetheless, mitigation measures are identified in **Section 5.2.9** that would result in reductions in construction noise impacts.

##### *Operational Noise Impacts*

###### *On-Site Operations Noise*

Alternative F would result in on-site operational noise sources, primarily traffic and parking-related activities in parking lots, the use of fans for HVAC systems, truck loading or unloading areas, tour bus parking, wastewater treatment plant operation, and central plant operation.

Noise due to traffic in parking lots would be limited by low speed limits, so that the noise from this source is not usually expected to represent a substantial source of noise. Human activity in parking lots that can produce noise that includes talking, yelling, and opening and closing of car doors and trunk lids. The noise levels associated with these activities cannot be precisely defined because of variables such as number of parking movements and the time of day. It is typical for a passing car in a parking lot to produce a maximum noise level of 60 dBA to 65 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, which is comparable to the level of a raised voice. The noise level associated with the idling of a modern diesel bus can be as high as 65 dBA at 50 feet.

Alternative F includes parking areas situated primarily adjacent to Lakeville Highway and a parking structure located adjacent to the proposed casino building, and setback from Lakeville Highway by approximately 800 feet. The nearest noise-sensitive land uses would be the houses located north of the site boundary approximately 1,600 feet away. As shown in **Table 4.10-2**, the noise level from passing on-site cars or buses would be 35 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptors. This level is lesser than the acceptable noise level of 60 dBA for a short-term on-site noise event, and would therefore be a less than significant impact.

The greatest potential for significant noise impacts would occur if fans or similar equipment were located near sensitive receivers. The casino would be equipped with HVAC fans, which could be significant noise sources. These would be located near the casino, which is situated approximately 2,300 feet from the nearest sensitive receptor, resulting in a noise level at the nearest sensitive receptor of 21 dBA, well below the acceptable noise level of 45 dBA for a continuous on-site noise event. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result.

Loading dock activity can be a significant noise source primarily as a result of the noise produced by passing trucks. Although the trucks would be moving at low speeds, the engine noise could be significant (typically 70 dBA to 75 dBA at 50 feet), and the number of and the time of day of the truck deliveries could affect the nearby noise-sensitive receivers. Loading docks would be at the rear of the casino building, and would be located approximately 2,500 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors. Maximum noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors due to truck movements at the loading docks would be approximately 41 dBA, well below the acceptable noise level of 60 dBA for a short-term on-site noise event. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result. Nonetheless, mitigation measures in **Section 5.2.9** have been added to further reduce this impact.

Noise from the WWTP and central plant machinery could be significant if these facilities were to be located adjacent to noise-sensitive uses, and if noise levels were to exceed acceptable limits. Note that most noise generating operations of the wastewater treatment plant and central plant would be enclosed except for exterior pumps,. In Alternative F, these facilities would be located behind the proposed casino, which would shield the nearest sensitive receptor to the north. As show in **Table 4.10-2**, unenclosed wastewater treatment pumps could result in noise levels of 43 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptors along Wilfred Avenue. This is lesser than the acceptable noise level of 45 dBA for a continuous on-site noise event and would represent a less than significant impact.

#### *Off-site Traffic Noise*

For the traffic noise impact analysis, it was assumed that worst-case noise exposures would occur at reference distances of 50 feet from the centerlines of the roadways. Truck mix was estimated from the short-term traffic counts and from Caltrans data. Day-night distribution of traffic noise was estimated as 87 percent, and 13 percent, respectively. Based upon the traffic analysis prepared for this project (**Appendix O**), the FHWA model was run to predict traffic noise levels for the roadways included in the traffic analysis. As shown in **Section 3.10.1**, changes in traffic noise levels could be potentially significant when resulting in ambient noise levels greater than 65 dB L<sub>dn</sub> or resulting in significant changes to ambient noise levels as shown in **Table 3.10-3**.

Road segments that are either currently above the 65 dB L<sub>dn</sub> land use compatibility criterion or those that would rise above this level with the introduction of project traffic are shown in **Table 4.10-5**. It is assumed that noise sensitive development is present or proposed immediately adjacent to all of the

segments that would be above this level and considered a significant impact. Mitigation measures are proposed in **Section 5.2.9** that would reduce traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Changes in traffic noise levels would exceed off-site traffic significance criteria (see **Table 3.10-3**) at one road segment, as shown in **Table 4.10-6**, resulting in a significant impact. Mitigation measures are provided in **Section 5.2.9** that would traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**TABLE 4.10-5**  
PREDICTED TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS AT  
REFERENCE DISTANCE – ALTERNATIVE F

Roadway	Segment	Predicted $L_{dn}$ , dB	
		Near-Term	Alt. F plus Near-Term
SR 37	At Lakeville Highway	<b>78.0</b>	<b>79.1</b>
SR 37	At SR 121	<b>76.2</b>	<b>77.2</b>
Lakeville Highway	At SR 37	<b>74.9</b>	<b>78.3</b>
SR 121	At SR 37	<b>71.8</b>	<b>72.1</b>

NOTE: **Bold** text indicates a potentially significant noise level.  
SOURCE: BBA, 2004, 2007, 2008b.

**TABLE 4.10-6**  
CHANGES IN PREDICTED TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS  
AT REFERENCE DISTANCES – ALTERNATIVE F

Roadway	Segments	Predicted $L_{dn}$ , dB
		Alt. F minus Near-Term
SR 37	At Lakeville Highway	1.1
SR 37	At SR 121	1.0
Lakeville Highway	At SR 37	<b>3.5</b>
SR 121	At SR 37	0.3

NOTE: **Bold** text indicates a potentially significant increase in noise levels.  
SOURCE: BBA, 2004, 2007, 2008b.

## **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

### **Construction**

Potentially significant impacts are similar to those described under Alternative B; please refer to the hazardous materials discussion under Alternative B above. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.9** to reduce the significance of the hazardous materials impacts.

### ***Operation***

The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative F are similar to those described under Alternative B. Refer to **Section 4.10.2** for a discussion of the potentially significant impacts. Mitigation is included in **Section 5.2.9** to reduce any significant impacts from the operation of Alternative F to a less than significant level.

### ***VISUAL RESOURCES***

#### ***Impacts Related to Regulatory Setting***

The Lakeville site is located within a Sonoma County General Plan designated “Scenic Landscape Unit.” SR-37 is designated by the State of California as a scenic corridor in the vicinity of the Lakeville site. The Lakeville site’s parcels are within an Open Space-Agriculture and Resource Management areas. Alternative F proposes to construct a regional commercial activity within a Scenic Landscape Unit and an Open Space area as designated by Sonoma County. The five parcels, which make up the Lakeville site are zoned as Land Extensive Agriculture and Scenic Resource. The Lakeville site is located in a visually sensitive area, as evidenced by the land use designations. Alternative F proposes to construct a regional commercial activity within these areas. Construction of Alternative F would therefore result in a significant and unavoidable visual impact.

#### ***Regional Impacts***

The Lakeville site is located in a rural, agricultural area in unincorporated Sonoma County near the intersection of Lakeville Highway (a County Scenic Corridor) and State Route 37 (SR-37), a California Scenic Highway and a County Scenic Corridor. The Lakeville Highway is the main thoroughfare characterizing the region, and begins on its south at SR-37, running northward until it turns west and joins the US-101 at the City of Petaluma. Alternative F proposes to construct a regional commercial activity along the main thoroughfare of the region, which would abruptly contrast with the rural and agricultural character of the region and vicinity. The construction of Alternative F would result in a significant and unavoidable visual impact with regard to the visual character of the region.

#### ***Impacts to Lakeville Site Viewshed***

Impacts to the Lakeville site viewshed are discussed below in terms of impacts within specific vistas. Sustained views from two scenic corridors (see below description of specific viewpoints) would be significantly impacted by intensive development on the Lakeville site. Since this impact cannot be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.

#### ***Vista A – Lakeville Highway Residential, Commercial and Commuter Vista***

The Lakeville Highway residential, commercial, and commuter vista would be impaired from the proposed development of Alternative F: **Figure 3.10-21** shows the Lakeville site as seen from the

southbound approach along the Lakeville Highway. **Figure 4.10-42** shows the proposed construction under Alternative F within the same view. **Figure 3.10-22** shows the Lakeville site as seen from a northbound approach along the Lakeville Highway. **Figure 4.10-43** shows the proposed construction under Alternative F within the same view. The construction of Alternative F would dominate the visual frame within this vista, obstructing the view to the open character of the region.

*Vista B – SR-37 Scenic and Commuter Vista*

The Lakeville site as seen from the SR-37 and Lakeville Highway intersection is shown on **Figure 3.10-23**. **Figure 4.10-44** shows the proposed construction of Alternative F within the same view. **Figure 3.10-24** shows the view to the Lakeville site from the SR-37 bridge over the Petaluma River. **Figure 4.10-45** shows the proposed construction of Alternative F within the same view. The construction of Alternative F would intrude the visual frame within this vista, encroaching upon the view to the open character of the region.

*Vista C – Regional Residential and Commercial Vista*

The construction of Alternative F would dominate the visual frame within this vista, obstructing the view to the open character of the region. A visible contrast in land uses would be observed by numerous residents, commuters and regional agricultural workers.

***Lighting and Glare***

Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation is identified in **Section 5.2.9** that reduces lighting and glare impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Figure 4.10-42

Figure 4.10-43

Figure 4.10-44

Figure 4.10-45

#### 4.10.7 ALTERNATIVE G – NO ACTION

##### *NOISE*

The City of Rohnert Park identified the potential for the generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards. If noise levels exceed 45 L<sub>dn</sub>/Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) in habitable rooms, a significant impact would result. Development in conjunction with cumulative traffic could result in potentially significant traffic noise impacts on the existing land uses in the area. Alternative G is expected to result in development on the Wilfred Site consistent with the Northwest Specific Plan. This development would result in noise impacts resulting from on-site construction, on-site operation of businesses and residences, and increased traffic volumes. Construction and on-site noise levels would be similar to those noted for Alternatives A-E, although an on-site wastewater treatment plant would not be included for Alternative G.

Alternative G noise levels are assumed to be equal to the difference between the noise levels for Alternative C and those for Alternative A, given that Alternative C is located close to Alternative A, has access from Wilfred Avenue, and would not displace Alternative G development (unlike Alternative A). **Table 4.10-7** shows that there are road segments that are either currently above the 65 dB L<sub>dn</sub> land use compatibility criterion or would rise above this level with the introduction of project traffic. It is assumed that noise sensitive development is present or proposed immediately adjacent to all of the segments that would be above this level. Therefore, this is considered a significant impact.

Changes in traffic noise levels would exceed off-site traffic significance criteria (see **Table 3.10-3**) at one road segment, as shown in **Table 4.10-8**, resulting in a significant impact.

Note that noise-sensitive development is present along Rohnert Park Expressway in the form of the mobile home park. The mobile home park has been designed with a large buffer zone and a sound barrier between the park and Rohnert Park Expressway. Thus traffic noise from Rohnert Park Expressway is not expected to significantly affect any sensitive receptors within the mobile home park.

The City of Rohnert Park identified the potential for the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The General Plan EIR analyzed potentially significant impacts related to temporary construction noise that may include excessive ground vibration. The EIR for the Northwest Specific Plan development would contain further mitigation measures to reduce noise impacts.

**TABLE 4.10-7**  
**PREDICTED TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS AT REFERENCE DISTANCES – ALTERNATIVE G**

Roadway	Segment	Predicted $L_{dn}$ , dB	
		Near-Term	Alternative G plus Near-Term
Rohnert Park Expressway	Labath to Stony Point	<b>69.8</b>	<b>69.8</b>
Stony Point Road	Rohnert Park Expressway to Wilfred	<b>73.2</b>	<b>73.6</b>
Redwood Drive	Rohnert Park Expressway to Wilfred Avenue	<b>67.4</b>	<b>67.4</b>
Commerce	Rohnert Park Expressway to Golf Course	64.7	64.7
Wilfred	Stony Point to Whistler	62.1	64.4
Wilfred	Whistler to Labath	62.1	<b>67.1</b>
Wilfred	Labath to Dowdell	<b>65.3</b>	<b>66.5</b>
Wilfred	Dowdell to Redwood	<b>66.4</b>	<b>67.9</b>
Wilfred	Redwood to SR101	<b>69.1</b>	<b>69.9</b>
Business Park	Labath to Redwood	61.6	61.6
Roberts Lake	Commerce to Golf Course	63.8	63.8
Millbrae	Stony Point to Primrose	61.7	61.9

NOTE: Bold values indicate potentially significant noise levels.  
 SOURCE: BBA, 2004, 2007, 2008b.

**TABLE 4.10-8**  
**CHANGES IN PREDICTED TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS AT REFERENCE DISTANCES – ALTERNATIVE G**

Roadway	Segments	Predicted $L_{dn}$ , dB
		Alternative G minus Near-Term
Rohnert Park Expressway	Labath to Stony Point	0.0
Stony Point Road	Rohnert Park Expressway to Wilfred	0.4
Redwood Drive	Rohnert Park Expressway to Wilfred Avenue	0.0
Commerce	Rohnert Park Expressway to Golf Course	0.0
Wilfred	Stony Point to Whistler	2.3
Wilfred	Whistler to Labath	<b>5.0</b>
Wilfred	Labath to Dowdell	1.2
Wilfred	Dowdell to Redwood	1.5
Wilfred	Redwood to SR101	0.8
Business Park	Labath to Redwood	0.0
Roberts Lake	Commerce to Golf Course	0.0
Millbrae	Stony Point to Primrose	0.2

NOTE: Bold values indicate a potentially significant increase in noise levels.  
 SOURCE: BBA, 2004, 2007, 2008b.

Alternative G would be developed under the authority of the Rohnert Park General Plan EIR, which specifies locally required mitigation measures to reduce the construction impacts above to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures in the Northwest Specific Plan EIR would reduce other noise impacts to a less than significant level.

#### ***HAZARDOUS MATERIALS***

Under Alternative G, a large residential development would occur on the northwest corner of the Wilfred Site.

#### ***Construction***

Potentially significant impacts during construction of Alternative G are similar to those described under Alternative A; refer to the hazardous materials discussion in **Section 4.10.2**. Under Alternative G, less construction would occur and the potential for impacts would be considerably lessened. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.9** to reduce the significance of the hazardous materials impacts during construction.

#### ***Operation***

The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative F would include household chemicals such as cleansers, detergents, paints, fertilizers, motor oils, etc. Chemicals that are intended for household use are generally stored in smaller amounts compared to chemicals that are intended for a commercial facility. Hazardous materials that would be stored or generated would be limited to household chemicals that would be stored in relatively smaller quantities. If a spill were to occur, the impacts would be considered relatively minor and would not be expected to have a significant impact on the environmental quality of the site. No significant impacts are expected.

#### ***VISUAL RESOURCES***

The City of Rohnert Park has identified visual impacts associated with Alternative G. Urban development is currently planned for in the City of Rohnert Park's Northwest Specific Plan and would blend with existing development to the south and east. Impacts would be similar to Alternative A, except reduced in intensity due to the reduced scale of development planned under the no-action alternative. Potentially significant lighting and glare impacts would occur. Mitigation appears in **Section 5.2.9** that would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### ***Lighting and Glare***

Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant

impact. Mitigation is identified in **Section 5.2.9** that reduces lighting and glare impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### **4.10.8 ALTERNATIVE H –REDUCED INTENSITY (WILFRED SITE)**

##### *NOISE*

##### *Construction Noise*

Construction activities associated with Alternative H would be similar to those described under Alternative D due to the similarity in construction footprint. Mechanical equipment used for construction and construction-related traffic would generate noise levels as indicated in **Table 4.10-1**. Maximum noise levels from different types of equipment and under different operating conditions could range from 70 dBA to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. This could result in the annoyance or sleep disruption for nearby rural residences along Wilfred Avenue (including connecting streets) and, to a lesser extent, the mobile home park located along Rohnert Park Expressway. However, the temporary nature of construction noise would result in a less-than-significant impact. Mitigation measures are identified in **Section 5.2.9** that would result in further reductions in construction noise impacts.

##### *Operational Noise Impacts*

##### *On-Site Operations Noise*

Operational activities associated with Alternative H would be similar to those described under the previous alternatives. Noise sources such as on-site traffic and parking-related activities in parking lots, use of fans for HVAC systems, truck loading or unloading areas, tour bus idling, wastewater treatment plant operation, and central plant operation may result in an annoyance to nearby sensitive receptors located along Wilfred Avenue.

Given that Alternative H's facilities would be similar to Alternative A and similarly situated on the Wilfred site when compared to Alternative A, impacts to the nearest sensitive receptors are expected to be similar as well (see **Table 4.10-2**). As with Alternative A, Alternative H would result in significant impacts to sensitive receptors due to on-site traffic circulation and on-site operation of unenclosed WWTP pumps. Mitigation measures proposed in **Section 5.2.9** would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

##### *Traffic Noise*

The traffic noise impact analysis for Alternative H used the same modeling assumptions as described under the previous alternatives. **Table 4.10-3** compares the near-term traffic noise levels (at a reference distance of 50 feet from roadway centerline) with anticipated traffic noise levels after the implementation of Alternative H. **Table 4.10-4** shows the predicted changes in traffic noise levels, as compared with near-term conditions for alternatives located on the Stony Point site. As shown in

**Section 3.10.1**, changes in traffic noise levels could be potentially significant when resulting in ambient noise levels greater than 65 dB L<sub>dn</sub> or resulting in significant changes to ambient noise levels as shown in **Table 3.10-3**.

Road segments that are either currently above the 65 dB L<sub>dn</sub> land use compatibility criterion or those that would rise above this level with the introduction of project traffic are shown in **Table 4.10-3**. It is assumed that noise sensitive development is present or proposed immediately adjacent to all of the segments that would be above this level. This is considered to be a significant impact. Mitigation measures are proposed in **Section 5.2.9** that would reduce traffic related noise impacts to a less than significant level.

Changes in traffic noise levels would exceed FICON significance criteria at several road segments, as shown in **Table 4.10-4**, resulting in a significant impact. Located along Rohnert Park Expressway is a mobile home park that is considered to be a sensitive receptor for noise impacts. The mobile home park has been designed with a large buffer zone and a sound barrier between the park and Rohnert Park Expressway. Traffic noise from Rohnert Park Expressway is not expected to significantly affect this sensitive receptor. Mitigation measures are provided in **Section 5.2.9** that would reduce traffic related noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### ***HAZARDOUS MATERIALS***

##### ***Construction***

Hazardous materials impacts resulting from construction of Alternative H will be identical to the impacts that were identified for the reduced intensity Alternative D. Alternative H includes identical square footages and components of Alternative D, therefore potential impacts as a result of construction activities would be the same as Alternative D.

##### ***Operation***

The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative H would be similar to those described under Alternative D. Refer to **Section 4.10.4**. Compared to Alternative A, groundwater pumping would be lessened as a result of the smaller development area proposed for Alternative H; nevertheless, groundwater pumping could potentially cause migration of contaminated groundwater from the adjacent LUST sites. This downward migration of contaminants into the deep aquifer could result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation is included in the **Section 5.2.2** and **Section 5.2.9** to reduce potentially significant impacts from hazardous materials during operation of Alternative H to a less-than-significant level.

## ***VISUAL RESOURCES***

### ***Impacts to Related Regulatory Setting***

As detailed in **Section 3.8** and noted in **Section 3.10**, the majority of the Wilfred site is located within the Rohnert Park/Santa Rosa Community Separator, including the northeast corner of the site that is proposed for intensive development under Alternative H. The Land Use Element of the Sonoma County General Plan identifies the importance of preserving open space between the County's cities and communities and maintaining them in a largely open or natural character with low intensities of development. The Open Space element identifies the need to preserve the visual identities of communities. Alternative H would encroach development within the Community Separator in seeming contradiction of this need. However, the Alternative H development area is also located within the City of Rohnert Park's Northwest Specific Plan area, within the City of Rohnert Park's sphere of influence, and is currently planned by the City for intensive development. In addition, the visual appearance of a regional commercial activity would be consistent with the regional commercial activities just east of the Wilfred site, along Redwood Drive and US-101. Therefore, visual impacts in terms of the land use planning would be less than significant.

### ***Regional Impacts***

The Wilfred site is located adjacent to a regional commercial area along the US-101. Construction of Alternative H would incorporate open space that partitions the sphere of influence for the City of Rohnert Park from agricultural and open space areas under County jurisdiction, and would further serve to partition the area from the community of Cotati, south of the Wilfred site. Regional commuters on US-101 would observe new construction consistent with the clustered regional commerce already in place along the US-101 at and in the vicinity of Wilfred Avenue and Business Park Drive. Thus, the regional visual impacts under Alternative H would be less than significant.

### ***Impacts to Wilfred Site Viewshed***

Impacts to the Wilfred site viewshed are discussed in terms of impacts within the constituent vistas of the viewshed. While the size of Alternative H is substantially reduced when compared to Alternative A, the visual mass associated with the reduced intensity casino/hotel resort is only slightly reduced when compared to the proposed project. While the proposed facilities would be visible, this alone does not constitute an impact. In that a regional commercial element is generally envisioned for the Northwest Specific Plan Area, the proposed facilities would be generally consistent with this vision. In addition, the view to the proposed facilities from public viewpoints would generally be intermittent. Thus, the visual impact of Alternative H within the below delineated viewsheds would be less than significant.

*Vista A- Wilfred Avenue*

**Figure 3.10-10** shows the view to the Wilfred site under existing conditions, from the northeast corner of Wilfred Avenue and Dowdell Avenue, northeast of the proposed construction area. **Figure 4.10-46** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative H within the same view. The residences identified in **Section 3.10** within this vista would experience a sustained view of the buildings against a backdrop of commercial development as planned within the guidelines of the City's General Plan and any construction consistent with the Northwest Specific Plan. Westbound commuters on Wilfred Avenue would be offered a dominant view of the proposed facilities upon entering the vista, and would continue observing this view for approximately half a minute until the facilities fall from view at the commuter's left flank. **Figure 3.10-11** provides a view of the existing conditions from the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel, northwest of the proposed construction area. **Figure 4.10-47** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative H within the same view. Residents west of the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel would experience a view to the facilities as described above, though the view would be considerably more distanced from the viewer. Upon entering the vista, eastbound commuters would observe the facilities against a backdrop of mountains, trees and commercial development, with the foreground dominating the view. The viewing time on this approach would be approximately one minute, during which the proposed facilities would come to dominate the southward view briefly before it passes out of view to the commuter's right flank.

*Vista B- Stony Point Road: Commuter Vista*

**Figure 3.10-12** shows the Wilfred site as seen from the corner of Stony Point Road and Wilfred Avenue under existing conditions. **Figure 4.10-48** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative H within the same view. The proposed facilities would be observed at an appreciable distance, against a backdrop of mountains, trees and commercial development, with the foreground dominating the view. As noted in **Section 3.10**, the southbound Stony Point Road commuter vista is approximately 0.34 miles. While the duration of visibility is dependent upon traffic conditions, deceleration and acceleration time where stoppage is required, an average speed of 50 mph offers approximately half a minute of view to southbound commuters on Stony Point Road, until the proposed construction site falls back from view to the commuter's left flank.

**Figure 3.10-13** shows the Wilfred site as seen from Stony Point Road near the Rohnert Park Expressway under existing conditions. **Figure 4.10-49** shows the proposed massing of the proposed construction under Alternative H within the same view. The distance of visibility on the northbound passing is approximately 0.7 miles. While the duration of visibility is dependent upon traffic conditions, deceleration and acceleration where stoppage is required, an average speed of 50 mph would offer approximately a one minute view to the proposed construction area before the commuter passes Wilfred Avenue, and the proposed construction area passes from forward-oriented view at the commuter's right flank.

Insert Figure 4.10-46

Insert Figure 4.10-47

Insert Figure 4.10-48

Insert Figure 2.10-49

*Vista C- Rohnert Park Expressway: Commuter Vista*

As discussed in **Section 3.10**, only intermittent views of the construction planned under Alternative A would be afforded to commuters on the Rohnert Park Expressway. The placement of the planned construction would be distanced from view relative to near-ground objects, while the impacts of foreshortening would continue to result in near-ground trees and topographical features dominating the view.

*Vista D- Southeast Quadrant: Residential and Business Park Vista*

**Figure 3.10-14** shows the perspective to the construction portion of the Wilfred site under existing conditions, but was taken at the apex of the berm and parallel to the tree line that normally obstruct views from the street. **Figure 4.10-50** shows the massing of the proposed construction under Alternative A within the same view. As noted in **Section 3.10**, Vista D provides a limited view northward for the trailer park at Rancho Verde Circle off Rohnert Park Expressway and the business park on Business Park Drive, southeast of the Wilfred site. Within this vista, a view of the proposed construction portion of the Wilfred site is afforded to westbound commuters on Business Park Drive, although it is largely obstructed by landscaping and trees along the northern side of the street.

*Vista E – US-101 and Interchange Businesses: Regional Commercial and Commuter Vista*

Regional commuters on US-101 would momentarily observe a portion of the Alternative H development, which would be consistent with the clustered regional commercial developments already in place along US-101 in the vicinity of Wilfred Avenue.

**Figures 3.10-16 – 3.10-19** show the view of the Wilfred site from US-101 under existing conditions. As noted in **Section 3.10.3**, the Wilfred site only momentarily comes into view for southbound commuters on the elevated portion of US-101 over Commerce Blvd.

**Figures 4.10-51 – 4.10-54** show the massing of the development under Alternative H within the same views. For much of the view from US-101, the Alternative H development is mostly obstructed due to existing development and vegetation. With the exception of viewpoint RP08, which was taken from a short, elevated section of US-101 in the vicinity of Wilfred Avenue, generally only the top of the hotel is clearly visible from the roadway. The parking structure is also partially visible from RP09 and RP10 (which is actually elevated above US-101), but note that these viewpoints were chosen in part for their ability to provide partially unobstructed views of the proposed development as well as their spacing in the viewshed. Only RP08 offers a momentary view of a large portion of the parking structure and the hotel from an elevated position.

Insert Figure 4.10-50

Insert Figure 4.10-51

Insert Figure 4.10-52

Insert Figure 4.10-53

Insert Figure 4.10-54

*Lighting and Glare*

Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation is identified in **Section 5.2.9** that reduces lighting and glare impacts to a less-than-significant level.